

THE ARTIST AND THE RELIGIOUS

SOME PENTECOSTAL REFLECTIONS

AFTER a meeting with old school-friends, lost to view for some ten or twelve years, a young Jesuit scholastic, confronted by his class next morning, fell to musing. He was once on those benches with his comrades. All but he seemed now to have found their place in the world, as business men, bankers, farmers, lawyers, writers, and what not. Some had married and already founded families. All were men, engaged on men's work. He alone, their equal in age, had remained a boy. The boys' horizon—a college campus—is his own. His, too, their petty cares, their devotions, their work, their sports. Capricious Time has carried him, abruptly and almost unchanged, from the student's bench to the teacher's rostrum.

And yet, he had been as well furnished for "life" as the next man. Even though he had elected to enter the religious life, he had not thought thereby to cross his name from the list of the *living*, but rather to assume the better part, in order to live and to give life. Yet, yesterday, amidst his old chums, the reality of what he might have been had served to expose the seeming nothingness of what he was. He alone has not lived, nor advanced in age. He alone has accomplished none of childhood's dreams.

The strange inutility of the religious state, the paradoxical death that calls itself religious life! To what shall we compare it, if not to the condition of that other useless atom, of that other exile from the common path: the artist, the poet? He, too, dreamer of dreams, to the outward eye one of the world's wrecks, forbidden shelter in the ideal republic,—he, too, is attuned to another rhythm than that of the society that ignores him. *In the world, yet not of it*, he pursues a dream of beauty that is never realized, a dream that to the vulgar spirit is but shadow, mirage, illusion; only to *his* eyes is it the one reality that makes life worth the living. And the poor piece of clay that gives itself—himself, herself—to God, not like others, by intervals, in lip-service or in outward reverence; the being who has given its heart away to the extent that religion has become for it a *state*, what else has life become for him besides a dream—of unearthly perfection? No wonder, then, that the religious life, with its three shearing vows, seems, like the pro-

fession of the poet, an adieu to all that other people call the reason of their being : competence, fecundity, freedom !

But—the life thus lost is found again : this is our point : this effacement is far from final. On the contrary, as we shall see, its sole function is to yield a more abundant life, in which the religious, like the artist, finds the secret of an unending victory over death itself.

I

The classic theme of the artist's penury is not all rhetorical imagination. Corot, at the close of his life, well schooled by experience, wrote : "A man ought not to embrace the career of an artist before he has felt in his heart a conquering passion for nature, and an unalterable disposition not to thirst after approbation or profit in money."¹ When he is gone, the artist's work, perhaps, will be priceless ; while he is alive it has brought little more than bare subsistence. Oh, yes, while stiffening his fingers, Death makes immortal his view of the universe, and rates it among those visions that shall never be again. But little, if at all, has the artist dreamt that his work should be an article of commerce. Let it bring him his living, of course. But make him rich—to what purpose ? Will all the gold in the world, and all the sensation it may buy, raise his ideal a single degree ? Will it give greater cunning to his hand, make his mind more keen ? He who lives solely for a world in which idea and matter are one, to the point where one exists only by reason of the other,—what indeed could he do with these lifeless treasures that belong to everyone, and therefore, to no one ? Scornfully, and without lowering his head, *oculo irretorto*, he passes them by, these riches in the abstract, that serve at best to fill an empty soul. More than that, if the kindness of some intelligent Maecenas place at his disposal all the resources of science and technique, the artist sees therein no special favour. Rather is he afraid that he will be distracted from his real task, or succumb to sham, or bask in the smiles of official approval.

To possess without being possessed, so as to have nothing and yet lack for nothing,—that is the motto of the religious, as it is the poet's. With Paul the tent-maker he cries : "having wherewith to feed and clothe myself, I am content." Beyond that is superfluity. Of worldly treasure he has brought nothing into the world ; and he will carry nothing away. Often a necessary instrument, it is always a dangerous one, because always foreign to his ideal. So the religious, even more than the artist, suspects the sumptuous façade and the six-figure

¹ Moneau-Nélaton, "Corot," p. 40.

income. In his eyes, a future handsomely-endowed bodes ill for the self-denial and the freedom necessary for the business of sanctity. Daily experience has taught him that, to-day as ever, the devil finds the best way to bind the Word of God is to use a chain of gold.

Yet in this attitude common to poet and religious, there is neither contempt nor disregard for the world of sense, as though it were the work of the Evil One. On the contrary, both of them love the world, but with that true love that wants not slavery, but the free and generous gift. That is why Dame Poverty has never found a more faithful lover, a more loyal knight, than that great artist in whose heart met the love of a naked Christ and that of nature's beauty, Saint Francis, the poor man of Assisi.

II

That poverty should be an appanage of the artist's life,—well, have it so. But *chastity*? Have not the young æsthetes of all the ages swelled the ranks of the bohemians with their facile pleasures? And yet, their true profession lends itself no more to vices of the flesh than to avarice and ambition. Beauty, of course, can give rise to passion; but only when the eye that beholds her is not simple. Æsthetic enjoyment rises from a contemplation which in itself admits of no troubling *mélange* of desire. It elevates, it purifies, it immortalizes, and thus delivers one from the longing to live on in one's children. In a word, beauty transports the artist beyond time, not to its end, but to its very beginning, and restores him to that blessed state where man and woman, clothed in grace and innocence, were not ashamed.

This term, at times, the poet reaches, indeed; but he cannot stand his ground. Nay, in the effort and through the reaction, he may find himself, more even than his brethren, a creature of flesh and blood. And thus it is that the very concupiscence of bohemian eyes and hearts remains an involuntary homage to the heights of innocence and beauty whence our world is fallen.

It is upon a summit higher still that, by the grace of the New Adam, the religious has made his vow to "imitate the purity of the angels." That is, his innocence is to be, not that of the child, unconscious of his grace, but that of a body already transformed into a spirit. The first is sterile, the second possesses freedom and fecundity. To create, indeed, the religious also needs an eye that is innocent. Thus only can the artist himself hope to sense the inexhaustible novelty that every corner of the world conceals. Think of Corot,

capturing the poesy in the landscapes of Ile de France. Thousands of eyes before his had scanned the same pools, the same hills—but they had seen them only through their own ideas. He who grasps nothing save by means of the reaction of his lower nature passions, and measures everything by his own interests, stifles the sense of the divine in his own heart. In like manner, the religious, sense purified. How else shall he discern in the vulgar, even ugly, interior landscapes of souls the seed of eternal life, that divine spark which it is his business to rekindle, to revive, to develop to full flame? Without agility and tact and delicacy of mind and heart, all the fruits of spiritual innocence, the chastity of the religious would serve no other purpose than to snatch him from an impure world; and merely negative would be his sacrifice. For the joys of a fruitful family life, with all its private worries, are far more estimable than sour and impotent selfishness in an old bachelor.

III

Allowing that the artist must regard purity at least as an ideal, wherein may he be said to be "*obedient*"? How can we hope ever to compare the "*regular*" with him whose sole motto seems to be compounded of fancy and caprice? Here, again, let us get below the surface, to realities.

A work of art, it is true, should always convey the impression of airy ease and freedom. But at what price has the artist thus succeeded in imitating and outdoing the creative spontaneity of Nature? At the price of a two-fold obedience: first, to the *technique* of his art, then to the *data* of his subject.

To express the beautiful, the artist has need of material substances: colours and sounds, stone or marble, movements or words. His first concern, then, must be to acquaint himself with the laws which govern the use of his materials. An excellent theme will avail the musician or the painter nothing, if the first ignores the science of harmony and modulation, and the second the laws of perspective and the content of his palette. Neither, thus ill-equipped, may ever hope to rise above the pretty, or the conventional. What is more, the artist's knowledge cannot remain theoretical; it must pass to the practical stage. For between general rules and the subject-matter of a work of art, there exists always the proverbial gap, wherein may lurk catastrophe as well as miracle.

What this technique requires, therefore, is a veritable "*asceticism*,"—long years of patient and painstaking discipline, during which academic themes and schoolboy exercises

aid the artist to acquire facility, accuracy, naturalness of execution, along with the turn of the hand, the fingering and the style that are his individual talents.

Nor is this the whole story. Even after the perfect mastery of his technique, the artist is hardly ever dependent upon the resources of his imagination alone. It has been remarked that the majority of the world's masterpieces are *oeuvres de circonstance*. This is tantamount to saying that a thousand social and moral exigencies prescribe for the artist, to a considerable extent, the very form of his canvas, and keep his imagination within judicious bounds.

The rules of his craft and the data supplied by circumstance,—these, then, constitute the double barrier which must encompass, yet do not suppress, the artist's spontaneity. These relentless restrictions, while eliminating those weaklings who cannot transcend them, furnish exactly the opposition which gives genius the chance to manifest itself, by demonstrating, in the very face of necessity and indeed by means of it, the incomparable freedom of the human spirit.

Who, then, will find it strange that the artist of the religious life, whose task it is to radiate the glorious freedom of Divine Love, should have to bear the yoke of a minute and constant obedience? In the measure that the human will transcends all material values, so much the more rigorous, absolute, inimical to caprice, should be the discipline that adjusts it to the purposes of art. The task is none the less indispensable to the business of moral perfection. Infinite, indeed, is the labour of moulding one's heart to the commands of Divine Grace, and of planning the self-conquest of every personal whim. Otherwise the will's brush can sketch only the rude, irregular features of uninspired humanity, whereas it should be about the business of giving to the world the harmonious image of the Perfect Man.

IV

Detachment or poverty, innocence and chastity, obedience and discipline;—yet we have hardly crossed the threshold of the blessed life which these walls serve to protect. But to what purpose a description in cold words of that inner sanctuary, when the feast of Pentecost, of the Gift of the Spirit, affords us at one and the same time a divine illustration of the *artistic* life, and the most authentic symbol of the *religious*? Have we not said all in showing that the commerce of the poet with beauty, of the religious with sanctity, is but the passionate and agonizing search for an ideal, an ideal that

constantly eludes the seeker, not indeed to discourage him, but to purify more and more his quest; until it reduces the soul, nay, the whole man, to the single attitude capable of calling down grace from Heaven: the attitude of Pentecost?

"A great artist," writes one of our modern *littérateurs*, "should have but one desire: to become as *human* as possible; or, better, to become *banal*. And the remarkable thing is, that he thus becomes most *personal*."¹ A total submission to nature as one sees it, absolute sincerity and forgetfulness of self,—here is the first instant of æsthetic creation. It was also the first step in the creation of grace. Divine Artist that He is, Our Lord has given us the example of this detachment from self and grasp of reality. Possessed of all the riches of divine "originality," He did not hesitate, so as to restore to us our personal dignity, to "empty" Himself, taking the form of a slave,² thus becoming human, *the most human of men*.

A magnificent lesson, which we are for ever forgetting! In our daily hurry we seek from Our Saviour only a few external rules of life; like the average college boy, who thinks he has an infallible recipe for success when he has analysed the work of genius or appropriated its formulae. Yet nothing so irritates in a work of art as traces of a mechanical process; and nothing rings so untrue as moral conduct inadequately motivated. For inevitably there will betray itself a secret attachment to things of sense, a lack of real faith in the unseen. Entire sincerity, the abandonment of self-interest in pursuit of truth, is the rarest of dispositions. Yet the only way to dominate and transfigure reality is to trust oneself to it, to suffer it passionately, lovingly, as did Christ, who, to give a new form and face to the world, became first its Victim; who bore in bitterness and pain the burden of ugliness and iniquity.

But passion and death find their fruition in a resurrection. The first reward of the creator, after the anguish of parturition, is the work of art itself. Matter, the "enemy," has been not annihilated, but subdued, and adorned with the brilliant robe of thought; the ideal has become sensible, has been realized. Realized, but only in part. And the artist has now to resist a temptation much more subtle than that which, as we have said, weds him to his own resources and hinders the act of faith: now he is tempted to think that he has reached achievement,—when in reality he has hardly begun.

¹ André Gide, "Billets à Angèle," *Nouvelle Revue Française*, March 1, 1921.

² Philippians ii. 7.

When the crucified Saviour rose again to a glorious life, the transfiguration of the world was begun, not accomplished. During forty days He continued the education of His disciples. He appeared to them, consoled them, permitted them to touch Him, to renew in part the old intimacy but to feel it only occasional and interrupted. On the road He kindles their hearts, but vanishes at the inn, leaving them only the bread in memory of Him. He allows them to breathe the first fragrance of His Kingdom's springtime, only to make them sigh for the harvest and the vintage!

It is always by the same steps that God guides our souls upwards, rewarding greater faith only by greater hope. So it is in the pursuit of every artistic ideal. Hardly has the work of art given its creator the first thrill of the divine, when another torment is born in his breast. Ever a man's reach must exceed his grasp. Let others admire, and speak of a masterpiece! *He* is a prey to sorrow, and spurns the mere shadow he has wrought. He perceives ever more clearly the abyss that lies between the pure beauty which lives in him, and its frail and fleeting externation. Yet, each genuine effort, is rewarded a hundredfold; although this very fecundity serves but as a goad to aspiration, constraining the searcher to a more thorough self-abandonment.

It was good for the disciples that Our Risen Lord should leave them and ascend to His Father. It is good for us, also, to have done with the illusion that our own efforts are responsible for our first vision of the ideal—as though everything were not given us from on high, for which Gift we must wait. That faith is not really detached, nor that hope really pure, which looks for the Kingdom of Israel here and now, instead of preparing for the coming of the Spirit. When, through faith and hope, we have been schooled into a sense of our own nothingness, then the Father sends His Spirit, the Spirit of Grace and Love; then charity comes to perfect faith and hope.

The poet, too, has known this hour, when, in the night of sense and spirit, suddenly the great wind descends upon him, and he is given a tongue of fire. The sublime hour of inspiration, when the artist, now the docile instrument in God's hands, gives forth his more than human oracles! Then all is easy, all is lightsome and alive; and, at the call of the new Orpheus, the rocks and the beasts assemble in a second Golden Age. This indeed is the hour of rapturous joy, of the new wine and its frenzy, when the Apostles see their burning words restore to their primitive unity the different tongues of

the listening throng; see stubborn hearts relent and yield to Christ; see the fire of love kindled once more in the world. We Christians need not wait for a fleeting inspiration. Christ has already cast His fire on the earth.

Pentecost is the feast of Humanity's inspiration, a feast for all peoples and all times, but especially for the religious, the artist of holiness, with his endless dreams of a Universe where all is new. For he has not merely known Jesus "according to the flesh"; his faith has been renewed by contact with His Spirit, and his hope has reached the ends of time. He has known Him who is love, and has believed in Him.

V

Small wonder, then, that the religious is silent in face of such questions as "What are you doing?" "What are you going to be?" Has he not here the very proof that his life is limited to no *definite* task at all? The artist, it is true, may answer that he is working on this subject or on that; but how shall he ever describe that nameless, formless, interior ideal, which, after all, is his sole reason for existence? What if the docile instruments of God's desires go shabby sometimes and know their hour of want, like gypsies without a home? What if they remain children while the world grows mature? It is precisely the blessing of eternal youth which, through their lives of faith and hope, the love of God wills to give to their contemporaries.

Nothing else, through all the ages, has brought these "useless monks and nuns" together,—nothing but the desire to make humanity divinely beautiful. How much that is stable and sublime in modern society had its roots in the work of the pioneer-monks of the early Church, of the artisan-monks of the Middle Ages, of the artist-monks of the Renaissance! To-day has its builders too, who, like their fathers, have the skill to chisel the living stones of the eternal cathedral to the form of a Divine Model. In our day and time there are eyes that are simple, and hearts that are eager to throw up against encroaching darkness those immense yet exquisite windows of stained glass through which, amid the play of colour and shadow, filters the Light of Light,—*Lumen de Lumine*.

Poor blind world, that cannot see that the religious is an artist *because* he is a religious, and because Pentecost is his special feast!

GASTON FESSARD, S.J.

THOSE WHO PRAY

II

THE Book of St. Ignatius's *Exercises* defines itself (Annotation I.) as "*a way of examining the conscience, meditating, contemplating, praying vocally and mentally, and of other spiritual activities*"; and the preliminary Notes themselves are intended to provide "some understanding in the Spiritual Exercises which follow, and that both he who is going to give them, and he who is going to accept them, may *help himself*." This notion of "helping one's self" is pleasant to St. Ignatius. He speaks of the fallen angels as having refused to help themselves by their free will, and uses the expression on many other occasions. The "Annotation" further compares to physical exercise "any method of preparing and disposing the soul in view of the removal of disordinate loves and of the subsequent search for and discovery of the Divine Will in the arrangement of life for the sake of eternal salvation."

Let us then recognize that St. Ignatius considers his Exercises to be one way among (possibly) many of doing this; and, as having a practical bearing upon one's manner of life in view of one's salvation.

The modesty of the Saint is apparent: the Exercises are "a" way; he leaves it to posterity to decide (as Popes have decided) whether or no they are a very good way, or a specially good way. Also, the very word "Exercise" excludes the notion that you should be using this way all the time. No athlete spends all his life in training or in performing. And athletes soon are past their prime and turn to other interests.

A modest and circumscribed claim. Yet, to my regret, I find myself at variance with a recent article¹ by one who has done as much as anyone to raise the whole level of English Catholic scholarship. He appears to me to limit the scope of the Exercises illegitimately; and to treat the topic of prayer, both in and out of connection with them, rather puzzlingly.

First, it is argued that St. Ignatius provides an admirable method for conversion from a worldly life to a devout life: "the Saint intended his Exercises for young men of good education and good abilities, who had not yet given much attention to spiritual things": he meant his exercises to be given "once

¹ M. Bremond and P. Cavellera; *Downside Review*, Jan. 1930, by Dom J. Chapman.

in a lifetime." "Beginners find the Ignatian method striking." St. Ignatius was "right in framing his elaborate system of meditations for unconverted young men." The Exercises are "admirable for those for whom they were meant."¹

I fear there is no evidence that St. Ignatius tied down the use of his method to so narrow a group. He is seen putting quite different sorts of people through the Exercises. Again, if he expected them to be made by some only once in a lifetime as a rule, he decreed that his own religious, in novitiate and in Third Probation, should repeat them. I submit further that few artists guess the whole of the possibilities or implications of their work. Plainly Ignatius did not foresee the full development of his own Society. Neither St. Benedict nor St. Francis foresaw what their Orders were to become. St. John of the Cross certainly meant his writings to be used by Carmelites: but it is right to extend that use, as indeed Dom Chapman does, and all my life I have tried to feed upon them, though I am neither Carmelite friar nor nun. Dead, indeed, would have been the book, rigid and mechanical its method, had it not been able to unfold a rich variety of possibilities and applications, and had men, true to its writer's spirit, not been able to make use of it in endlessly flexible ways. I do not think that the "new Society" has at all suffered from a snapping of tradition, so that it now *mis-uses* the Exercises. If it erred, I might more easily have thought that it did so by adhering too obstinately to its pre-Suppression memories. But in so far as those who "give" the Exercises adapt them, they are only doing what St. Ignatius and the Directorium keep telling them to do. They are accused of doing what the book itself insists that they ought to do. It demands again and again that the giver must (i) observe the "disposition of the subject," the temperament, as we would say, of the retreatant, and (ii) not interfere with God. I return to this below. Never did the Saint demand slavish submission from anyone to anything. "I made you Rector," he wrote to a priest who was always asking detailed advice, "*rule!*"

Do I deny that some users, or givers, of the Exercises, appreciate, use, or give them awry? Of course not. Anyone can make a mess of anything. The old adage "*Laborare est Orare*" has been used as an excuse for substituting exterior work for prayer: the Office, that *Opus Dei*, has been so

¹ These views, it may be mentioned, clash with the official "Constitutions" of St. Ignatius, in which the Exercises are often mentioned both as an aid to *perfection* for members of the Society and as a means to win souls to God. Cp. the index of any good edition of the "Constitutions," s.v. *Exercitia*.

mascot-ized that we have heard of a nun who declared that the due recitation of one Antiphon was worth more than an hour of contemplation: ecclesiastics have been known to speak lightly of the Liturgy: I have met priests who decried and even eschewed the instructing of converts. No caricature of a principle is of much interest. The man who says that any method in art, or athletics, or education, has all the value, all the time, for all men equally, never need be listened to. If, then, the nature of the Exercises or their utilization has been caricatured even by their friends, no one need be surprised or be worried. So has Franciscan poverty; so has Benedictine peace; so has Dominican philosophy. It remains that papal, general, and Jesuit tradition is wholly alien to the notion that it is false to the nature or intention of the Exercises to "give" them more than once, or often, in a lifetime, or that they are suited to one sort of person only, such as the "young," or the "worldly," or to what is so strangely entitled "the beginner."

Still, it is argued that, however much the giver of an Ignatian Retreat "adapted" the Exercises to individuals or groups, he still would and must be providing what was suitable only to "beginners," because he is booked to a "method" which either involves no prayer at all, or, a low sort of prayer which should be transcended so soon as possible. For what does St. Ignatius do? He provides a number of subjects, concerned with God, the soul, the angels, sin, death and hell; with Our Lord, His Life, Death and Resurrection; with what he calls "love," *i.e.*, of God. He then says: "You must first remember what the subject is, and, if it admits of it, picture it by the help of the imagination. You must then reason about it, and finally, move your will so that it makes suitable resolutions about it." No doubt he adds, "You must then speak to God about it—make a 'colloquy,' and end up with some set vocal prayer like the Pater." But on the whole, we read, this procedure cannot be called "prayer" at all; it may be an ascetical preliminary to prayer, or to the exciting of yourself to virtuous actions, but *prayer* it is not. And even if in some wide sense it be called prayer, it ceases to be the sort of prayer that suits those who have advanced to any extent in spiritual things.

I must repeat that the Exercises, far from envisaging only one sort of spiritual activity, take many into their purview—"meditating, *contemplating*, praying vocally and mentally, and others"—and also, provide a variety of "ways" of praying, each to be tried when another, or others, do not suit. In-

deed, just in proportion as the *book* of the Exercises is intended for use in a *retreat*, and has its value largely from the *sequence* of subjects that it offers, it is less likely that St. Ignatius would have insisted on the exclusive use of one method during daily "meditation" had he foreseen that custom coming to hold the position that it does. Professor J. Howley, in the judicious article previously mentioned (*Studies*, March, 1930, p. 48), puts that well. Even so, I expect that the Ignatian "meditation" succeeds in supplying *habitual* help to *most* people who embark on such an hour, provided always that they recall his own injunction—when you have got what you want, remain there—*ibi quiescas*.¹

Once more, it is insisted that the Exercises are useful, as their author "meant" them to be—only for beginners. Others try to use them, and fail. Nothing more dispiriting! "This is what *usually* happens. Beginners find the Ignatian method striking: they repeat it with *less* success, and yet again with *none at all*." Hence those who give the Exercises annually to the same people follow them but "partially and distantly," introduce new matter "to interest or *startle*"; reduce the month to a week or a week-end; omit the "election." Religious who "have" to attend get good from the 8 days' silence, but regard the "sermons" as a bore. (*Italics mine*.) So far as adaptation goes, such adapters are doing less even than St. Ignatius recommends, though they do not try to "startle" nor do they deliver sermons. Ignatius is most anxious that the personality of the giver should be effaced so far as possible. He should begin, naturally, with a "true foundation of fact" (Annotation 2), but then, be "summary," brief in his suggestions, that the work may be truly done by him who is endeavouring to make the "fact" better understood and felt, "whether this happens by means of his personal reasoning, *or in so far as the intelligence is illuminated by the divine enlightening*." The director would be silly if he did not try to "interest" sufficiently to

¹ I cannot believe that this injunction is forgotten by those who teach the use of the Ignatian method. Fr. Roothaan's exhaustive articulation of every consideration that a mind could put to itself while thinking out a subject, does not imply that it should actually, and each time, use all those considerations, any more than an ordnance survey suggests that a man should visit all the places marked on the map, if he visits any. I had three novice-masters, one in England, two in France, most different in temperament. None of them would have dreamed of suggesting such a thing. I remember saying that sometimes I found the "introductory prayer," by means of which you remind yourself that it is into God's special presence you are passing, so "satisfying" that I might wish to go no further with my meditation. Their replies were prudent, but did me no violence, though I will not admit that, if I was "praying" till I began to reflect upon the subject assigned, I must have stopped praying once I began to do so.

stimulate the listener to start to pray: but he should not "startle," save in so far as all divine subject-matter becomes startling once it penetrates or re-penetrates our crass and forgetful souls. Missions, perhaps, aim at startling the thick-hided into repentance; but even while giving mission-sermons, the missionary must be "standing back" mentally, lest he dream that the work is to be done by himself, and lest he give no room to the Holy Ghost. And indeed, I think that the utility of "startling" missions is diminishing rapidly. The modern world can hardly be astonished, and refuses to be scared; it asks for common sense as starting-point, and if the missionary starts anywhere else he never meets his listeners. In a world of cinemas, no ecclesiastical melodrama or even ritual is likely to "impress" or attract so much, *on its own merits*, as the picture palace. However, retreats are emphatically not missions, nor are the "points" of meditation to be sermons. I never forget a sentence I once heard. "Flashy Father X interests me; but it's dull old Father Z who converts me!"

"Converts?" So the Exercises are for beginners, after all? But when does one cease to require conversion? "*Ascensiones disposuit . . .*" "*Dixi, nunc coepi!*" I don't forget that the psalmist's words meant that "Now at last I begin to understand," and were spoken in bitterness. God's arm, he said to himself, was shortened, and that is why the world is so evil. Still, the application is justifiable! Old truths suddenly become so illuminated that you may feel you are seeing something new. I have known men who actually thought they were losing their faith, when they were finding it—or rather, seeing depths and heights in its contents hitherto unsuspected. Hence far from finding that the reiteration of the Exercises necessarily makes them tedious, I confess that I constantly am wondering how inexhaustible they are, and how even to read their pages may inspire one with new amazements. Are, then, retreats never dull? God knows they can be. What priest, in or out of choir, fails at times to find his Office dull? How many nuns have sadly said that even Mass tends to become routine! No one man, who gives a retreat, can equally serve all his hearers all the time. Of course you can get tired to death by just sitting on a bench and listening. Of course you can feel: "I've heard all that before"—you can feel this about the Sermon on the Mount! And your temperament may clash with the retreat-giver's. What in the world succeeds equally all the time? But I fear I must deny *in toto* the validity of the business metaphor of "diminishing returns" when applied

to spiritual or even psychological affairs. [A shop uses an advertisement. People get accustomed to it. It no more draws attention. Change it!] I know Wagner's operas almost by heart. Does repetition stale them? No. If I so much as read a piano score of one of them, I find new and even ecstatically lovely riches within it. No new detail; but new implications, interconnections, and joys. As though the drama of God, and Soul, and Sin, or even the pages of the gospels (let alone Christ's actual life and death and triumph) were less fertile than a piece of music! Nor are they dead matter, merely to be pulled about into new shapes by me. God's Spirit indwells and vivifies them, and communicates them to the poor labourer. But *labour*, to some degree, he must. The eleventh-hour worker won his reward—but he *had* worked, though but a little.

"Ah, but I'm not denying the value—God help me!—of the subject-matter, nor even of a certain use of intellectual reflection upon it, with suitable resolutions concerning it; but, of the intolerable re-telling of an oft-told tale—the sheer *shape* of the Exercises!" Well, I have known religious (far more "contemplative" than I) not only to derive, precisely, an increasing value from the Exercises in proportion as, by practice, they fathom them better, but to express gratitude definitely for their *order*, (i) as such, and (ii) as familiar already. They are not asked to listen to a haphazard series of "sermons," but they move in an orderly way through the whole extent of the spiritual life, so smothered by the fatiguing multiplicity of life's exterior duties. And, they like to feel that they know, at least vaguely and in general, the *sort* of thing that is coming next, and not to be taken aback by speakers who suddenly transport them into strange lands. I must obstinately assert that, as each year passes, my experience, such as it is, convinces me that the Ignatian order is possibly the only quite suitable one for use in a retreat. It corresponds to human nature, and to everything in human nature, and perhaps to modern human nature in particular, to its depths and its heights, and also to its special contemporary necessities, as nothing else does. In a word, I think it the *best method* for the enormous majority of mankind. And if it be said: "Well, the immense majority are but 'beginners,' and that 'fervent religious,' capable of something special in the line of prayer, are but 'a few-per-millions of Christians,'" I think that the word "beginner" is being misused. If everyone save a few-per-million is a beginner, and the Exercises are useful for

beginners, they are useful for the enormous mass of mankind, religious included, and we must quite give up talking about "unconverted young men." All such allusions appear to me out of touch with St. Ignatius, his book and his method, with history at large, and with the emphatic declarations of the Holy See.

I fear, too, that the metaphor—athletic, this time, not commercial—of "natural handicap" is out of place in spiritual things. You practise golf, for example, improve up to a point, and then improve no more, practise as you may. So, we read, with the Ignatian method. You use it, improve visibly, and then "stop dead." We cease to have "the delirious joy of seeing that we are becoming saints." Shocking suggestion, that (whether or no we strip off exterior faults) we ought ever to see anything save that we are sinners! But the misapprehension goes deeper. Obviously, I ought not to settle that I can do a *certain amount* towards becoming holy (not excluding, of course, the assistance of grace, or graces, sacramental or not) and no more than that—for who knows at all what he is truly capable of, let alone what the Holy Spirit intends that he shall become capable of? : but, if the suggestion is that *for a while* my own "activities" on the whole ought to acquire for me "natural virtues," (is any virtue, in a Christian, merely natural? Grace supernaturalizes all life, even eating . . .), and that then, on the whole, God's direct action ought to supersede any action of mine, I would reply that the direct activity of God is quite so much implied in, desired and sought during, *any* period of my development as in the later ones. Never will my activities be wholly eliminated; never was God's activity anything but wholly energetic. The whole of myself must be wholly interactive with Omnipotent God, else I am in a subdivided state. No wonder St. John of the Cross compared ecstasies to "dislocations of the bones," and that St. Teresa said that she would sacrifice all her supreme experiences for the merit of any one act of virtue.

What I am asking for here is, the recognition that the Grace of God, that is, Eternal Life, can be energizing in me quite as much when I am meditating as when I am "contemplating," and this is the only thing that matters. If "meditation" be so much insisted on as a valuable method, it is because plenty of people think they are contemplating when they are not; that most people detest taking trouble and that the Exercises or even one Ignatian meditation implies taking a lot of trouble—indeed, any retreat, or meditation ought to do so—so that

indolent people dislike Ignatian retreats more than any other sort and, taking refuge in un-exacting methods, think that they are "mystics." Hence, if (as was rather harshly said) the enormous mass of Christians are hardly in the "purgative way" at all, it remains that meditation, especially in the orderly Ignatian way, is what suits the enormous mass of Christians, among whom I am not sorry to find myself. My experience of their virtue, when I have had them in retreat (be they bishops or bargees), has been such as to humiliate me to the dust. The person who profits most by a retreat may be the giver.

So far, I have but said that I hold that the Exercises and St. Ignatius's method of meditation deserve none of the limitations which have been imposed on them and certainly are caricatured by being applauded as good for "beginners" only, unless by that word you describe practically every Catholic Christian. I now wish, in the space remaining to me, to insist that meditation is, or should be, prayer, or at any rate, that St. Ignatius considers his method to include the practice of "contemplation." St. Ignatius puts his Exercises into four "weeks." He considers the *same* man as making *all* of them. Yet he uses the *same* method throughout. He calls the first "week" "more proper" to men in the "purgative way," that is, to men trying to get rid of sin, or the habit of a sin, or even, of a less good spiritual situation; the remaining "weeks" as more apt for men in the "illuminative way," that is, those obtaining "lights" concerning God, and self, and Christ, and the world: the fourth "week" indeed, is suited to one who aspires to the "unitive way," yet the final "*Contemplatio ad Amorem*" involves as much meditation in the Ignatian sense as any of the preceding exercises do. Our critic, however, says that "meditation" is "useful, fruitful and *possible*" in the purgative way, "contemplation," in the illuminative. Indeed, "contemplation is not *possible* in the purgative way, nor meditation in the illuminative." "When contemplation intrudes through the window, it kicks meditation out at the door." It is, then, obvious that Dom Chapman uses the words, "meditation," "contemplation," "purgative," "illuminative," in a sense quite different from St. Ignatius's, and whatever be the value of his argument it is in no sense a criticism on the Exercises or on St. Ignatius's method of praying. He wrote, in *Pax*, an article on Contemplative Prayer, which did not mention St. Ignatius, but had independent value. I can accept, perhaps, every word of it, the more easily because he uses several words as St. Ignatius does not use them.

I confess that everyone suffers from the inclination to "divide hot and cold with a hatchet," especially those who have had a training in logic, and, therefore, all Catholic students. St. Ignatius avoids this danger by using comparatives—"more suited," and so forth. To begin with, I distrust very much this slicing of men up as *either* in the "purgative way," *or* in the "illuminative" one. I hold that a soul can very rapidly shrink, as it were, or expand, so as to be in a state of purification on the whole or of illumination on the whole, alternately; further, that it can be, being on the whole purified, but *by means of* illuminations; or, primarily illuminated with a purifying effect. Hence I am fairly sure that a man not yet able to keep wholly clear of sin can often "contemplate"; and quite sure that one who is advancing rapidly in virtue must often meditate. The Hebrew prophet could manifestly see, in *one* glance at *one* object, a contemporary event, a general principle of right and wrong, and a future (i) natural (ii) supernatural consummation. When St. Mary Magdalen de' Pazzi (or another) fell "into ecstasy" at the sight of a flower because it made her think of "God," this did not mean (or needed not to mean) that the consciousness of the flower was obliterated from her awareness—to suggest that she ought to have ceased to be conscious of it in favour (so to say) of God would have been an insult to the reality, truth and goodness of His Creation—but that in *one* glance she saw more than one thing—"creation in a point"—and fell into celestial joy. Example. I was once so enthralled by a musical phrase that I walked about half a mile uphill (this requires some doing!) without noticing it. This did honour to that which the phrase inspired in me. But it was a dislocation of the psychological bones; I would have been more "complete" had I been entranced by the music, *and* aware of the spring green, *and* careful where I put my feet. . . .

Hence, suppose that a man observes that at a certain moment he wishes to repose on what he possesses, and no more to reflect upon it; *ibi quiescat*, says St. Ignatius. If he *merely* finds reflection "difficult," it does not in the least follow that he has got what he needs. But does his director *probably* and at once suggest that his "impuissances" are due to his own negligence? I have met no such director! Nor may I ever meet those "affective" arithmeticians who are supposed to say that you must first meditate 25 minutes so as to spend 5 in "affections," and gradually invert the proportions. But first, nothing will make me so degrade the notion

of the "Dark Night" as to suppose it need have any connection with these "difficulties" in meditation, nor yet to apply the very technical and exalted notion of "ligature" to the inability of many pious souls to "meditate." Dom Chapman has a really amusing page concerned with what he thinks the average good Jesuit must say, with many blushes, about his morning meditation. "The holy man would hum and haw . . ." and acknowledge that he cannot always manage it. . . Of course he would not always find his meditation easy, any more than the Benedictine finds his office always succulent or the nun her Mass. There is nothing here to do with ligature, contemplation, or faultiness, or anything but the normal vibrations of manifold human nature. A man may be called to "contemplation": he may actually "contemplate" quite often during the hour, and within the act, of meditation. St. Ignatius would be quite pleased that he should do so; but not because a man finds meditation irksome can you judge that he is doing so or called to do so.

Meditation is not in the least psychologically unsound, even in hours of mental prayer (the writer admits that it is "necessary for all" (note, p. 15), though "outside our hours of mental prayer." It must "retire except for emergencies"). Meditation does not at all provide a "topsy-turvy" method, nor so make use of imagination, intelligence and will, let alone "sensitive devotion," as to exclude, while they are being used, the direct action of God, any more than the direct action of God need annihilate, even temporarily, the activity of all that is in man. If a caricaturist of what I am saying could accuse me of semi-Pelagianism, I, were I to caricature the caricaturist, could accuse him quite properly of Manichæism. Things that are good (as all our faculties and our use of them are) are only *less* good when viewed in isolation (as St. Ignatius never views anything) and as though self-sufficient. I cannot think of anything much more misleading here than metaphors drawn from Fascism! The spiritual king—God, I presume—never disregards the services of his allies. He wishes to make the maximum use even of the imagination. Given that I am, in any intelligible sense, to be body-soul in eternity, shall I not, in eternity, be able to know and love *one flower*, for what it is worth? I shall not have to see God in spite of it, but because of it and in it, and by means of it, as truly as I see flowers, or *a flower*, in God. In those interspaces when the sublimated intellect is unable "to understand the Our Father," I conclude that the human Totum is to some

extent crippled and in a pitiable state. Not so shall we be in Heaven! The Beatific Vision will neither bind nor stun.

Here is introduced a metaphor—not commercial this time, nor athletic, but mechanical. An aeroplane is started by a mechanic taking the tips of the blades and twirling them. (So does “meditation” take hold of the “periphery” of the soul, work from sense to spirit, and set things going.) He then jumps out of the way, and off the plane goes, from its intrinsic power. He would not have succeeded, had he tried to twist the hub; but, having set the hub twisting, it has no more need of him. True, after a while the plane comes down and “needs mending”. . . . But meanwhile the “engine” (?) has carried us on, and the Aeronaut. Having meekly enquired from two or three aviators: “What about all this?”, I observe, first, that the metaphor could have been used even more anti-meditation-wise than it was—what you gain in leverage you lose in velocity. But again, without such leverage, you would obtain no velocity at all. And finally, you cannot, ever, dispense with the engine. (I could not cope with a metaphor drawn from gliders!) The act of the mechanic endures into the action of the engine; in a true sense, the energy of the mechanic survives in every revolution of the propeller. In no case is the Aviator the sole agent. Neither is God, in prayer. Most metaphors trip: this one hobbles.

I have had to emphasize one element in a complex whole, perhaps too heavily, because the balance had been too pushfully upset in an opposite direction. I detest these controversies about prayer. For me, Prayer is any activity of mine which causes me to become more deeply united with God. Of course God originates even the “lower” forms of this; of course what God does is more important than what I do, provided it be always remembered that the higher the prayer, the more active *I*, too, am, else it is not I who am praying at all—God has *substituted* Himself for me. In Christianity there is no such substitution—Christ Himself did not die just instead of me, nor triumph in my place. I in Him must both die, and rise again. I am united with God, just because God preserves me—but thus to be preserved is not prayer, though it can generate prayer,—if for example I remember it and am grateful and glad in it. If I am thinking about God, I can also be aware that I am already in closer union with God than if I forgot Him, and can be glad of that, and this is prayer. We cannot dream that any application of the reasoning intelligence (as when one studies theology) must exclude prayer.

I can pray inside my syllogisms! Here is no "metaphysical monster." When the soul desires, and the will chooses and decides, all of this in Christ and through Christ, and because of Him, here need be no mere asceticism, and not prayer. Such meditation and resolution can and should be not merely preparation for and consequences of prayer, but part and parcel of it. As a matter of fact, the article so often alluded to, though flippant now and again, even as the French writers are now and again angry and sarcastic, (thereby all but depriving their work of any but ephemeral interest and also making it far more sad than amusing or helpful), ends by identifying the perfect ascesis with the perfect prayer. So be it. I presume that the vast mass of Christians is neither perfectly virtuous nor perfectly in "prayer-union" with Our Lord. For these, the Exercises, and the Ignatian meditation, are of undying value, and "cater" not only for the humbler moments of the spiritual life, but for the sublimest too. Moreover, since the existence of all-but-all humans must be active, and since Our Lord in the gospels never hints that it ought not to be but emphasizes that it should be, the massive impulse given by the Exercises to self-devotion on behalf of Christ, within His semi-conquered Kingdom, is right, and if one had to choose one adjective which in no way could possibly be adequate for their type of spirituality it would be "self-concerned,"¹ since the "Kingdom of Christ" teaches us so only to attend to Self as to sacrifice it for the sake of others, and of Another. But I *must* be able to pray inside my most exterior activity! And not only the upshot of the "Fourth Week," but the normal Ignatian self-offering—*Sume et Suscipe*—which hands over once and for all to God all separate human activities of ours—memory, intellect, will, and liberty itself—makes "restitution" of them all, gives them all over to the divine Governing, asks but for love and for grace—manifestly contains all the whole ideal that any Christian mystic may dare to propose, and sacrifices nothing of those facts of human life that the psychologist cannot but register.

I fear I must remain convinced that the Ignatian Exercises and their method provide normally and for most people an adequate way of uniting their lives with God; that they are true prayer; and "reach strongly and sweetly from end to end," as I saw in the case of the man who made one of the best retreats I remember, and he was a Cardiff docker.

C. C. MARTINDALE.

¹ "History of Europe," by Fr. B. Jarrett, O.P., p. 318.

ST. PIUS V. AND ELIZABETH

THE BULL "REGNANS IN EXCELSIS"

BEFORE we begin to consider this, our immediate subject, it will be necessary to investigate in some detail the relationship between the Papacy and England in feudal times.

"We must distinguish between Kings who are feudatories of the Holy See and others wholly free, like the King of the French. For many kingdoms have, out of devotion, recognized the Holy See as having supreme feudal authority either because they have been offered to Blessed Peter as his tributaries. . . . Of this kind are the Kingdoms of Sicily, Aragon, England. For King Ethelwulf made the Kingdom of England tributary and, during the reign of Leo IV., appointed an annual tribute, extending it to the whole of England. . . . Moreover, Inas [Ine] one of the Kings of the Heptarchy, instituted Peter's Pence. . . . The supreme Pontiffs conferred the title of king to [the monarchs of] Hungary, Croatia, Poland, Portugal, Ireland. . . . But in an especial manner the Kingdom of England was made feudal to the Holy See on May 23, 1213, by King John."¹

This last sentence is the one of real importance, The days of Ethelwulf are somewhat dim, and those of Ine almost darkness. Feudality was as yet undeveloped in England, and the modern precise phraseology of the Roman Curia would sound strange in our forefathers' ears. In any case, whatever Ethelwulf may have intended and Leo IV. have understood, there is the further question as to an English King's power at that time to commit the country generally and in perpetuity. Let us jump the gap from Ethelwulf to Harold and see the relations between the English crown and the Holy See in 1066.

The opinion of Europe generally was against Harold. His act was regarded as one of usurpation, though there was nothing approaching to agreement as to the lawful occupant of the throne. Indeed, Harold, unless we assert the elective nature of the crown, which had been so, as amongst all primitive Germanic folk, but was long since obsolete, had not a claim beyond what any other powerful "Earl" might put for-

¹ *Instit. Jur. Pub. Eccles.* (Cavagnis), Vol. II. 1906.

ward. That Harold had become William's "man" after his rescue from the Count of Ponthieu, and that he promised on some relics to do all in his power to secure the crown for the Duke of Normandy, after the Confessor's death, is certain.

William appealed to the Head of the Church, Alexander II., to decide between his claim and that of Harold, as, seventy years later, did the Empress Matilda and Stephen on the subject of their respective claims. For some reason Harold neglected to state his case to Alexander. The Pope sent the Duke a banner and bade him capture his Kingdom. To ask for Papal arbitration was not necessarily to recognize any overlordship, as the sequel shows. Sometime, about 1080, St. Gregory VII. sent a legate to demand from William an oath of fealty and to provide for the punctual payment of the tribute of Peter's Pence. This was an ancient due and William at once admitted England's liability. In respect of feudal allegiance, however, William repudiated all recognition of it. He asserted that he had never promised it to Alexander before his expedition, which seems to be the fact, and moreover, none of his predecessors had ever done so. The matter was allowed to drop at Rome, for the Pope found himself confronted by ever-increasing difficulties, and within five years, St. Gregory VII. died in exile.

So far our evidence for deference to the Pope, except in matters of spiritual supremacy and arbitration, is non-conclusive. A wholly different step was that taken by the Conqueror's remote descendant John, and this deserves our closest attention. Although King John is said to have surrendered his Kingdom to Innocent III., it would be more accurate to speak of his recognizing the Pope as his feudal overlord, since the conception of sovereignty was then something quite different to that of territorial ownership, which is hardly seen before the sixteenth century. The Kings of England paid homage to the Kings of France for Aquitaine, and Philip Augustus in 1204 summoned John either to give up to his nephew Arthur all his French fiefs or answer to the judgment of his peers in Paris. John did neither; the sentence of the peers went against him and declared him deprived of all his lands. Philip at once proceeded to put this sentence into force by invading Normandy. This was an extreme exercise of feudal rights, for in respect of the Duchy of Normandy the rights of the French King were admittedly very tenuous.

King John in his English quarrel had adopted a time-honoured way of putting his opponents in the wrong. After the In-

terdict and subsequent excommunication, they had begun to press him closely; now by professing to become a vassal of the Pope, and even more by taking the Cross, he was able to turn the Papal censures against his enemies. The usual "Protestant" contention, that this step was resented by his subjects as degrading their country, has not the slightest contemporary support. So little was the feeling of nationality developed that, a little later, we find these same barons siding with the Dauphin whom they had invited to take the crown of England, with such success that only the military genius of John saved his throne. The question of "foreign rule" simply did not arise in the cosmopolitan society of the thirteenth century. Louis was no "foreigner" to the Anglo-Norman barons, still less was the Pope considered an intruder in national affairs. Indeed, of such sentiment there is hardly a trace until the Hundred Years' War.

The famous Charter itself, misinterpreted as a "bulwark of English liberties," was at the time of its origin, mainly a device to secure baronial privileges. Its chief object was to guarantee the baronage against the encroachments of the royal courts, the centralizing policy which Henry II. had begun against constant resistance from the great landowners. Its real importance arose from its being used later in the interests of a Parliamentary oligarchy against the Divine Right of the Stuarts; indeed, in a very true sense, Magna Carta may be said to have been invented by Coke, Hampden, Eliot and others, for the actual grievances which gave it birth and the very meaning of its phraseology had become quite obscure by the seventeenth century. Indeed, it is only in our days, owing to the work of English and French scholars, that the real but limited importance of the Charter has been made clear. Accordingly, the Pope cannot be said to have conspired against English liberties; on the contrary, in supporting the King he was acting, as was also St. Louis later in the Mise of Amiens, if we may use an anachronism, in the interests of the people at large.

In any case, Innocent annulled the Charter in a Bull of August 24, 1215, as doubtless John had foreseen when he allowed his seal to be affixed. John in the previous March had taken the Cross, and in May he pointed out to the Pope that the activities of his barons would prevent him from carrying out his obligations. To this we will return.

In Innocent's Bull the vassal relation of England to the Papacy is clearly mentioned: it was, indeed, recognized by

all parties at this time, and most explicitly in the barons' letter to the Pope of February, 1215; Philip Augustus and Louis, whose interests lay the other way, alone refused to do so. Moreover, these two did not deny the fact of vassalage, but questioned the legality of John's action in causing it. John had made the matter quite plain in two charters, of May 13 and October 5, 1213, in which England is for the first time called *patrimonium beati Petri*. Roger of Wendover asserts that at some unspecified time before the concession of Magna Carta, the King had protested that, since the Kingdom of England belonged to the Church *ratione dominii*, he could decree no new thing without the Pope's consent: an appeal to feudal law. The Pope makes the same appeal when, in the Bull of Annulment (August, 1215) he states that he had made to the barons an offer "to do full justice according to the tenour of our ordinance," and on their refusal that the "Appealing to Us, proposed to them to submit his cause to Us, to whom pertains, because of our supremacy, the judgment of this case." No other procedure, in strict feudal law, was possible, except the plan, adopted formerly by Philip, of summoning a court of the feudatory's lay peers to consider the case. The Pope clearly could not do this. Of his other royal vassals, the King of Aragon was a minor, the King of Sicily was fighting for the Imperial crown, and it would be hard to bring the feudatories of Hungary and the Balkans to Rome. In any case, it was open to question whether such sovereigns could be called the peers of England's monarch; for they had no point of feudal contact with John as had Philip's French peers.

Besides, John did not hold England by complete feudal tenure, for in the terms of his grant to the Holy See there was clearly no question of military service but only a strictly defined money tribute. This was called a *feudum censuale*, and the term is also applied by Innocent III. to the case of Aragon. John is to make the payment "instead of all customary service otherwise due"—a clear and normal arrangement. The Pope would, consequently, be bound to protect the King against loss of his fief from external aggression or internal rebellion.

At the same time, there was another non-feudal, but a recognized legal and spiritual, ground for Papal interference. John, as we have seen, had formally "taken the Cross." The Crusade (that of 1203) the Pope had encouraged by granting extensive privileges to all Crusaders who had assumed that

obligation : amongst them was relief from any engagements which prevented the carrying out of their vow. In this way, those who, like the barons, were likely to impede John's discharge of his obligation came under Papal censure in another way.

We must pass over many years to the sixteenth century. Henry VIII. had heaped iniquity on iniquity, had violated the rights and seized the possessions of the Church, had plundered religious houses, had judicially murdered Thomas More, John Fisher and many others ; finally, by the Acts, 25 Hen. VIII. C. 19 and 26, Hen. VIII. C. 1., he had definitely repudiated the jurisdiction of Rome. Paul III. reissued the Bull of excommunication in 1538, and attempted to secure its publication in France, or at least in Scotland and Ireland. This act of spiritual authority on the part of the Pope was fully justified, and Henry was so far alarmed by the fear of more worldly penalties that he put his realm in a state of defence and enacted the *Six Articles*, by way of an answer to the taunts of Europe that the English and their King were all heretics. The real significance of these events lay in the fact that, for the first time in the history of Christendom, a monarch had repudiated the Papal supremacy and forced such repudiation on his subjects under pain of death, whilst on the other hand the Papal censures had had little effect : neither France nor the Emperor would stir in active fashion.

We now come to the excommunication and deposition of Queen Elizabeth. After the display of much patience by Pius IV., and during the earlier years of his successor, the fact of Elizabeth's determination to persist in heresy became patent. Consequently, in 1570, St. Pius V. issued the famous Bull of Excommunication—*Regnans in Excelsis*. He had every possible reason to proceed thus to extremities. The Queen had been crowned as a Catholic. The *Liber Regalis* had been exactly followed in every detail, very probably lest any doubt should rest upon the validity of the coronation. Thus Elizabeth, by her Coronation oath, voluntarily accepted responsibility for the rights of the Church. She had not yet determined how far to go with the Reformation. Very soon, circumstances, not to say the pressure of evil counsel, caused her to go all the way, for she never allowed her convictions, such as they were, to oppose her worldly interests : in which policy, to be sure, she was neither better nor worse than most renaissance Princes. Her own tastes were for the old religion in the Henrician form, and she never at heart liked the Cal-

vinist system; but when once she had definitely decided to break wholly with the Church, the Calvinists alone could give her effective help and driving power.

This fact is clearly expressed in the Bull. She allows sermons to be preached in the Calvinistic manner and is present at them, and has the Lord's Supper celebrated *more haeretico*; and so sin is added to sin and the ruin of religion daily grows worse, under the direction of the said Elizabeth. Observe the sequence: from allowing, she proceeds logically to partaking in heretical worship. Furthermore, she was proceeding by methods of persecution to compel her subjects to follow her example. Hence her contumacy was so open and notorious that the Pope had practically no alternative. There is next to nothing said in the Bull as to the soundness of her claim to the throne or as to the duty of her subjects to depose her: still less as to the claim of Mary Stuart. The expressions *pretensa Angliae regina* and *regno occupato* refer to the former Bull which declared the child of Anne Boleyn incapable of succeeding, a sentence pronounced with even greater emphasis by Cranmer and the English Parliament. Cranmer was a true Primate of England, albeit a heretic, and his pronouncements, when not directly contradicted by Rome, had legal weight. His motives were due to servility, but his sentence as to the illegitimacy of Anne Boleyn's daughter concurred with that of the Pope.

Let us hear Lord Acton, who was a severe critic of many of St. Pius's deeds. "Nothing in the character or position of Elizabeth exempted her from a vigorous application of these maxims [*i.e.*, the authoritative grounds for deposition]. In the judgment of the entire Catholic world she was a bastard and usurper and the most successful oppressor of the Church then living. If the summary punishment of contumacy could ever be justified, it was reasonable to apply it to her."

But it may be asked whether, even admitting the spiritual validity of the excommunication, the deposition can be upheld on the theory of the feudal overlordship of the Pope; since whatever may have been conceded by John in the thirteenth century was certainly revoked and swept away by succeeding monarchs (as by Edward III., in 1366) and more recently by the Acts of Henry VIII. before cited, which forbade the payment of annates, which ordered that all ecclesiastical elections should be conducted without reference to a "foreign power," and which prescribed the cessation of the payment of Peter's Pence and all other pensions to Rome. Henry's Acts spoke

of the intolerable exaction of great sums of money, usurped in derogation of the King's imperial crown and authority royal. Other monarchs, such as the French, paid no feudal dues and exercised considerable control over the French Church: was not Henry justified in claiming similar freedom?

The answer to the objection is that the consent of both parties is required to break or invalidate a bilateral contract of such international importance as that of the feudal rights of the Holy See over England which began in the thirteenth century, if not earlier. Some such consideration may have been in the mind of St. Pius in launching his excommunication, for feudal theories took long to die, and naturally survived longest in the oldest court in Christendom. But it was the paramount spiritual claims of the Pope to obedience that were emphasized in the Bull; so much so that though Elizabeth was deposed, no particular candidate was designed to take her place. Still less, we may remark, was any person authorized to kill her as an outlaw. What St. Pius hoped for was a rising caused by the growing disaffection of Elizabeth's subjects, not by any means wholly due to religion, and their choice of some sovereign who would restore the Faith. He was certainly not thinking of the Queen of Scots whose conduct, at one time though not now, he regarded as not much better than her cousin's. According to the international law of the time, the Pope's action may easily be justified.

We will now consider the matter shortly from the point of view of political expediency, which is entirely different. In this respect the opinion of those best qualified to judge was even at the time very diverse, and the most able historians have subsequently been equally divided. The late Father Pollen, S.J., certainly one of those who were most deeply read in the sixteenth century history, considered that the Pope acted under a misapprehension and that a step which, although primarily religious was also political, ought not to have been concerted without the advice of those who understood the whole situation from within. The Marian exiles in Rome, who had suffered much and were men of distinction, had lost touch with reality in their own land and like all exiles, religious or political, were men of one idea. They saw the opportunities for overthrowing the Queen or of re-establishing religion through badly focussing glasses. In truth, the times were all against material success for St. Pius.

Paul III. had been content to excommunicate Henry VIII., for he knew that neither Charles V., nor Francis I., for politi-

cal reasons, could individually or together be brought to interfere actively with the King of England, and matters had since moved still further from the mediaeval world. The principle of Divine Right, the irresponsibility of sovereigns to any earthly superior, was in the ascendant. Thus, at the time of the publication of the Bull, viz., February 25, 1570, the political situation was all in favour of Elizabeth and all against the Pope. Elizabeth's support was being sought by France and Spain and she had not yet definitely committed herself to the French Alliance. The Kings of France in particular, and also the King of Spain were both upholders of Divine Right. Charles IX. simply forbade the publication of the Bull in France. Philip II. was annoyed and said that it would only embitter feeling, cause the Queen further to oppress good Catholics, with loss of prestige to the Holy See, more trouble of conscience, and the falling away of the weak. In every detail the King proved right, but there were compensating advantages. The Duke of Alba, who cannot, any more than his master, be regarded as lenient towards heresy, agreed, and the Bull was refused publication in the Spanish dominions. Maximilian II. also flatly refused, and even asked the Pope to withdraw his Bull, which St. Pius in his turn declined to do. The Emperor, be it remembered, had Protestant Electors under him, and it was neither in his will nor in his power to depose them. He was bound by the religious peace of Augsburg. In fact, St. Pius had been careful to confine his gravamen against Elizabeth to her support of Calvinism. For the time, Lutheranism was politically respectable owing to the attitude of the Emperor, in which Pius IV. had concurred.

That the Bull was impossible of application and exposed all Catholics to the penalties of treason without the possibility of giving them any help soon became clear, and Gregory XIII. authorized a more lenient interpretation by making the very sound distinction between *willing* and *unwilling* obedience. This has been represented as mere duplicity, but as Mr. Beesly remarked in his "Queen Elizabeth" is perfectly reasonable. He took as an example the attitude of every Alsatian who then gave an unwilling recognition to the German Emperor as compared to those who accepted him gladly. I suppose that much the same attitude applies to many in South Tirol to-day.

We have alluded to compensating advantages. As a matter of fact, *Regnans in Excelsis* did not seem anything out-

rageous to the people of the day. Catholic monarchs, we have seen, disliked it and it was certainly resented by the English Government and probably by half of the people; but it seemed to be quite a natural thing for a Pope to do. There was very little contemporary controversy on the subject. Elizabeth, like her father, was really rather scared as well as irritated, and preferred to leave the matter alone as much as possible, whilst English Catholics were clearly not interested in obtruding the Bull on the notice of others. What it really did was to mark, once for all, a clear and absolute distinction between the new religion and the old, and to prevent the continuance of practical tolerance of heresy which had been infecting English Catholics. Their descendants, therefore, have no reason to quarrel with St. Pius. His high principles and good intentions were recognized even by the most hostile, and won esteem from a man so unlikely as Bacon, who wrote, not long after, of the "excellent Pius Quintus." The fact is we find a great difficulty in successfully transporting ourselves back out of our own generation, and yet some will talk with certainty as to the inner motives of those who lived over three centuries ago.

There are no grounds for thinking that Sixtus V. reissued this Bull, after the fate of the Queen of Scots, to speed the Armada. No trace of it can be found. Lord Burghley certainly sent what he said was a copy of it to Attorney General Popham for use in the Arundell case; but Elizabeth's ministers had, as we know, a suspicious liking for copies.

MAURICE WILKINSON.

SCIENTIFIC SPIRITUAL PLUMBING

HOW THE LEAKAGE WAS STOPPED IN ONE PARISH

SINCE the celebration of the Emancipation centenary we Catholics have been taking stock of our position, observing past progress and noting our prospects for the future. Our growth in numbers, prestige and effectiveness has been considerable, our present position gives reason to hope for better things in the years to come, we stand on the threshold of great expectations, equipped with resources far larger than we have ever enjoyed before. Almighty God has set before the Catholics of this country a golden opportunity to spread His Kingdom; He has blessed them both with the means of conquest and the will to win,—surely then there is nothing we dare not hope for!

Alas! we cannot go far in our stock-taking before we come up against what we commonly call "The Leakage Question,"¹ and realize that we have here a difficulty of the first order, which is likely to make any future progress precarious and even illusory.

It is not necessary to insist on the fact that there *is* a leakage—we know it only too well. Much however might be said about the volume of the leakage and about its principal causes. Estimates of the number of Catholics who give up the practice of their religion vary very considerably. Some authorities who have studied the subject, assert that the annual loss on this account is greater than the annual gain by conversions to the Faith. According to this view, the growth of the Catholic body is slower than would be provided for by the annual increase arising from the birth of children to Catholic parents—in other words, apart from our converts and immigration of Catholics, we are a dying body! This view does not appear to be so wide of the mark when we examine the figures given by Father H. Thurston in "Statistical Progress," his contribution to the symposium on Catholic Emancipation published in 1929:

If we only include under the term Catholic those who fulfil their Easter duties and normally hear Mass on a

¹ A shrewd and helpful writer in the *Southwark Record* has protested against the idea implied by the metaphor "leakage." He would call it "wastage," due not to circumstances so much as to individual apathy, for in similar surroundings some persevere and some fall away. However, the term has a definite and intelligible meaning.

Sunday, the estimate of 2,156,146 which stands in the *Catholic Directory* would probably be even excessive. . . . But if, on the other hand, a Catholic be understood to be one who would not repudiate the description himself, who was willing to have his children baptized in the faith and would probably welcome the help of a priest on his death-bed, the evidence seems abundantly to warrant the conclusion that there are at present rather over than under three million souls who, subject to a less rigid interpretation of the term, could fairly be described as Catholics.

If these figures are accepted, the "standing leakage" is in the neighbourhood of one million. This is not the place to criticize such a view, or to discuss the statistics; let it be enough to say that there are good grounds for supposing that in some large parishes the "ought-to-be" Catholics may well be in excess of the practising Catholics.

Such a state of affairs constitutes a very grievous wound in the body of the Church, and so long as it persists we must realize that we are in a sickly condition, and to that extent unfitted for the huge task which lies before us. Unfortunately we have become more or less habituated to this dreadful loss of souls, and have come to regard it as normal. So largely has this attitude been adopted, that in many quarters the lost sheep are entirely neglected, and the whole pastoral effort is concentrated on those who remain within the fold, and on answering the applications of converts. Surely one cannot emphasize too strongly that this is a most unhealthy state of things! We should indeed pay dearly for our converts if we gained them only at the expense of as many souls lost to us—souls that have once seen the Light, and have drifted out again to shadows which are therefore all the darker. *Corruptio optimi pessima*; the lapsed Catholic is only too often, not merely a loss in the negative sense, but also a positive source of weakness, of scandal and of bad example.

Among the principal causes of the leakage must be reckoned the frequent drifting away of our children when they leave school. Here, again, exact statistics are hard to come by, but no one who is in touch with the matter will deny that this drifting-away may rightly be described as very large. Some contend that as many as nine out of every ten Catholic boys cease the practice of their religion within a year after

leaving school. True, some of these come back to their duties after a time, but meanwhile sin and infidelity are playing havoc with heart and conscience. Many of them are certainly lost completely and go to swell the ranks of the "ought-to-be" Catholics. In a year or two some of them will cease to lay claim even to the name: a generation passes, and they with their little ones are caught in the floods of unbelief and swept for ever out of our reach.

The Hierarchy has constantly and insistently drawn attention to the paramount necessity of Catholic schools for Catholic children, and in this matter the response of the laity has been magnificent. The importance of sound educational formation on Catholic principles is plain to all; the provision of Catholic schools is the first step towards safeguarding our children's faith. And yet it is only the *first* step, and unless further safeguarding work is undertaken, the sacrifices which have been and are still being made for our schools will be largely thrown away.

Enough has been written to show that there is actually a great leakage of Catholic children on leaving school, and that this is one of the most disquieting features of our times. Looking over the files of various Catholic publications, we find the question coming up again and again for many years back, and it is clearly the opinion of those best qualified to judge, that we have long been faced with a great problem, the solution of which is becoming more and more imperative. The Bishop of Southwark, in whose diocese so much splendid work is done for children, has devoted his 1930 Lenten Pastoral to this subject. His Lordship asks:

When the children leave school to face the perils of workshop and of non-Catholic surroundings, at an age when their rapidly developing minds and bodies are making the duty of keeping the Faith and of living good lives yet more difficult, how many older Catholics do anything to help them? When young men or women leave their homes and a familiar Catholic district in search of work, who is there who thinks of following them up with help in their new surroundings by a letter to the parish priest or to some Catholic acquaintance in the new district?

And indeed, quite apart from the authority of those who have written on this subject, it is obvious, from the very

nature of the case, that there must be a very great risk to the faith of our boys when they leave school. And if there is a great risk, the actual loss of faith must frequently occur. Let us for simplicity's sake confine ourselves to the boys. If they can be made secure, there is little to fear for the other sex. In many cases, perhaps in the majority of cases, when a boy of 14 or 15 starts work, nothing is done to help him. All the care and solicitude lavished on him at school ceases abruptly; instead of being in the midst of Catholic companions, he is often associated with youths and young men whose speech and way of life are a constant challenge to all that he has been taught to respect as just and holy and of good report. The physiological and psychic changes of adolescence demand an adaptation, new experiences crowd upon him apace, life puts its myriad questions—and the answers are supplied ready-made, from tainted sources. Amid all this confusion of impressions, at the time above all when the formation of *character* is trembling in the balance, too often there is not a word of help or a sign of interest from outside. Small wonder if disaster follows!

Humanly speaking, we can devise no educational system which will make a boy proof against such an onslaught, yet not to remedy such conditions must almost inevitably involve the ruin of a vast number of Catholic boys, subjected to them. Add to this the fact that family life and parental control, where indeed they exist at all, become relaxed much earlier than was formerly the case, and it will be seen that we are sending our boys out from school to fight a very desperate battle. Working boys of 14 to 16 are too old to care to associate with those still at school, and they are still too young to be taken fully into the society of men; they are therefore in a small class of their own, a class that is largely isolated from outside contact. In this class, Catholic working boys are necessarily in the minority, and from the very start the individual Catholic is swamped by the non-Catholic majority.

But it will be objected that what has been said so far arises from the assumption that nothing is being done for boys when they leave school, while, as a matter of fact, up and down the country, there is much zealous and successful work done among boys of this class. Happily this is true, and it may be hoped that the volume and scope of this work

will go on steadily increasing. It is, however, also true, unfortunately, that in perhaps the majority of districts the problem has not yet been effectively tackled. Parishes exist with 200 to 300 working boys, in which members of the boys' society or sodality do not exceed a score or so. At the children's Mass the Communion rails are thronged, while the monthly Communion for men and boys shows a saddening contrast.

Here then is the problem! What are the remedies, how shall we find a solution? It must be clear from the first that little or nothing will be accomplished without *work*; hard, unremitting and often disappointing *work*. Moreover, a little consideration will make it evident that the parochial clergy are quite unable to take the whole burden of this work on their own shoulders. Were they to attempt to do so, in most cases no great measure of success could be hoped for; the task demands constant personal touch with the boys, and this can only be effected by the keen co-operation of many lay-workers. Co-operation,—for the very nature of the case makes it clear that the work is first and foremost and quite definitely in the province of the parish priest. But since he cannot discharge this duty unaided, he rightly looks to zealous and loyal help from the layfolk of his parish.

Now an urgent appeal to the laity is seldom made in vain, and there are few parishes indeed in which there are not workers ready and willing to take some part in the apostolate. We have then the problem, and in most cases we have clergy and laity anxious to work together towards its solution—what else do we need?

The answer is that we need *system*: anti-leakage work must be systematic, co-ordinated, and business-like. Indeed this is a business problem and we must treat it as such, scrutinizing our profit-and-loss accounts with a sort of apostolic avarice. It is in order specially to emphasize the need of *system* and co-ordination in after-care work that this paper has been written; far too little after-care work is being done; what little is being done is partially ineffective through lack of system and co-ordination; the great expansion of this work which we look for must proceed along systematic and co-ordinated lines. We are fortunate in being able to describe an after-care system in actual and successful operation.

The writer recently had the privilege of spending a few days in a north-country industrial town. In one of the Catholic parishes of this town, a parish of about 5,000 Catholics, the working boy problem existed in an acute form; it was attacked by energetic and systematic work, and these efforts have been rewarded by *complete success*. *In twelve years not a single boy has been lost to the Faith*. Now it is not suggested that the scheme to be described is the only possible one. But it is a scheme that has been in actual practice for 12 years, a period long enough to put theory to a searching test. After several long and intimate conversations, the parish priest was kind enough to place at the writer's disposal some exhaustive notes which he had written about this aspect of his work for boys. I shall not hesitate to quote at length from these notes, since their direct and forceful language can scarcely be improved upon.

Since the problem exists everywhere, it is evident that after-care work should not be merely parochial, but national and even international; otherwise a danger of leakage arises when a boy moves from one parish to another. Experience has shown that leakage does take place under these circumstances. The scheme to be adopted had therefore to be such as could be put into operation in any parish, however poor. It was found that Scouts, Boys' Brigades, Boys' Clubs, and the like, all cost money to run, and this difficulty was felt as a serious hindrance. An effective scheme had therefore to be found which did not cost money. In this particular parish, the foundation-stone of the work for the boys is the Boys' Sodality of Our Lady; a Sodality can be erected in any parish, however poor. This Sodality has two parts—boys at school and working boys up to 16 years of age. Boys at school can always be kept secure; so attention is focussed on the working boys.

The Council, or Governing Body, of the Boys' Sodality, with the parish priest as Director, is composed, not of boys, but of members of the Men's Sodality. The parish is divided up into twenty districts, and to each of twenty young men one of these districts is assigned. In this manner a live-contact is maintained with the whole parish, so that any defect is immediately felt. Let us see how the plan is shown at work:

On the Boys' Sodality monthly Communion Sunday, each of my twenty young men places in my hands, by

three o'clock on the same Sunday afternoon, the names of all working boys who have been absent from Sodality Mass and Communion. I call my Council together, discuss this list, and assign to each member those boys who are in his district. *That same week* the member visits each house to find out the reason why the boy has been absent. The reasons given are written down and sent to me, sometimes with a note to the effect that the only hope is a visit from me. Such visit is made *at once* by me. All this implies, of course, solid hard work, work too that is depressing often-times on account of the atmosphere of the homes.

With this spade-work going on continuously and systematically, the details of the scheme are filled in thus:

Every week I give a special talk to boys in the top classes of our two Elementary Schools, during the year before they leave school for work. This aims at preparing them for the temptations and the kind of company they are bound to meet.

By consulting parents and boys, I find out what the boy wants to work at, and then go round to various employers, promise them a good type of boy, and get them to take an interest in the boy's career. By this means I am able to get boys straight to work when they leave school, and to know exactly what their surroundings are. When it is a big works they enter, I put each boy under the care of a good Catholic working man there, so as to make the boy feel that he has a friend.

The special talks, begun during the year previous to leaving school, are continued after they go out to work. On Sodality Sunday the working boys are separated from the school boys for this purpose. Sometimes I get a layman of the Sodality to give them. To hear a young man who has had experience telling them what "going straight" means makes a great impression.

All this work goes on till the boys are 16 years of age. At that age they are transferred to the Men's Sodality. In the Men's Sodality the same friendly supervision is continued, with visits and reports to me. Also at 16 the boys become eligible for the Men's Club, which they are keen to join. Membership means keeping up Sunday Mass and Sodality Communion, and any slackening off

in this matter is immediately noted. The parish Football Club, run by the men, is another link. The club exists simply and solely as a means of catching the boys and keeping them straight.

Lastly, every year I have a working boys' Retreat. It is essential for the success of this that the expense should be kept at the barest minimum, and so the fee is 2s. 6d. per day, for which they get breakfast, dinner and tea. Here again, the recruiting for the Retreat is in the hands of the men. It is amazing how much boys like to feel that their elders are interested in them; they like to be thought men themselves.

And now what about the success of the scheme? The words which follow leave little doubt on that score:

The scheme starts with success. Contact is maintained with every boy. If he is slackening, if contact is broken, the cause is investigated *at once*—a very important factor.

In a London parish, when I was in charge of the boys, only twelve were attending Mass on Sunday and going to Holy Communion. I put my scheme into operation, and at the end of one year had brought in 120 boys. Then, alas! I was transferred to another sphere of action, without being able to provide for the continuance of the work. Within two months of my departure my 120 boys were lost again, because nobody took up the work.

On an average, there are about 30 to 40 working boys coming direct from school each year. Throughout a period of 12 years' working of the scheme in my present parish there is not a single case of any of my boys giving up Mass, or giving up the practice of his religion, *except when and only when they have left the district and gone elsewhere.*

What a truly magnificent result! If the same work were going forward in every parish throughout the length and breadth of the land, the whole face of things would be changed in a generation. This is in fact the only defect of the scheme—that it is not yet a *national organization*:

Let me make this clear by an example. One of my boys, 15 years of age, was showing the results of the scheme—keen on Mass and Sodality Communion. Everything seemed set fair for his future. Suddenly his

parents removed to another place. I met him six months later, and had only to look at his eyes. He was all wrong, and could not hide it. Why this lapse? Because nobody was bothering about him. If only the scheme had existed in his new parish!

I urge, therefore, that the solution of the leakage question must be national, not parochial. Had the same system been spread throughout the land, all I had to do in this boy's case was to write informing the parish priest of his arrival. Unless the work is being done everywhere the continuation of help for the immature is impossible. The heart-breaking thing to me is that the only boys of this parish who are lost to the Faith, are the boys who leave it.

What we have to realize is that *isolated effort* will not stop this terrible leakage among boys. We have talked enough. Now we must take our coats off and work like blacks, each in his own parish, and so make the solution of the leakage question national, so that wherever a boy goes he is met by friends interested in his welfare.

This then is the simple description of a plan which has been in operation for 12 years, and which has been, and still is, an unqualified success. To what particular elements is this success due? First and foremost success has been won by hard work and system. An important factor in this system is the prompt and unfailing following-up of any slackness. Our enemy "goeth about like a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour," and is prompt in following up *his* advantages; we must forestall him with even greater promptness. Again, the work has been backed up by the energetic and loyal co-operation of laymen, without whose help it could not have been attempted. That the Council of the Boys' Sodality is made up of members of the Men's Sodality is a feature of the highest importance. The boys very greatly appreciate the interest which the men take in them, and in this way something is done towards bridging the gap which exists between the small community of working boys and the grown-ups. Clearly the men themselves benefit enormously by their participation in this apostolic work, and the whole parish is welded and knit together into one great spiritual organism.

Surely this is the truly Christian way of setting to work,—

mutual help and interest; loyal service for Christ's sake; the strong helping and protecting the weak until they too become strong; all centring round the solid corporate devotion developed by the Sodality, so as to realize the Apostle's ideal: "We that are stronger ought to bear the infirmities of the weak and not to please ourselves" (Rom. xv. 1).

But it is clear that, restricted to scattered and isolated parishes, this scheme cannot be a thorough solution of the leakage problem. To be really effective the organization must be, not parochial merely, nor diocesan, but national. Labour is growing increasingly mobile, but our working boys should not be able to move beyond our care. We need a national organization of Catholic laymen who will offer themselves to the parish clergy to work for the boys of the parish, in systematic co-operation with similar work in all other parishes. In casting about in one's mind for such an organization, one naturally thinks of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, whose workers are found in so many countries. Or the C.Y.M.S. Or the "Apostolic League." Or the Knights of St. Columba, who have close contact with similar bodies in America, Scotland, and elsewhere. It would seem that this work for boys is in harmony with the general aims of all these organizations, to say nothing of the various "Third Orders." However the work be tackled, and tackled it must be, it is certain that some sort of centralized control will be required, or at least the very closest liaison must be maintained between the various fields of action. This article will not be wholly useless if it stimulates an interest in this aspect of the question, and calls forth suggestions as to the nature of the far-flung organization which must come into existence, sooner or later, if the Faith is to flourish in this land.

We have been slow and backward in this matter; we have not come up to the hopes which our fathers had of us. In his great Stockport address of 1899, Cardinal Vaughan spoke as follows:

The need of this [work for children] is becoming recognized, and I believe that the first quarter of the coming century will see among us the organization, upon a wide scale, of this necessary work of co-operation for the benefit of young people between the ages of 13 [the then school-leaving age] and 20. It will be, indeed, a grand Catholic Brotherhood when one-third of the population

is cherished and taught by elder brothers and sisters, regardless of social rank, of rich or poor.

Alas! the first quarter of the century has come and gone, and still we lack that great nation-wide organization of laymen which the Cardinal envisaged. What is the cause of our remissness? It will not do to say off-hand that there is lack of material to call upon, for experience belies such a suggestion. On all sides we find indications of zeal, energy, loyalty and ready willingness on the part of the layman. The trouble is that this readiness has not yet learnt to find an organized outlet for itself. We have not yet become accustomed to the Lay Apostolate as a normal and a necessary thing. We must get habituated to the idea that it is not exceptional for a layman to take part in apostolic work, but rather that it is a reproach to him if he does not do so. The Catholic must come to regard himself as by that very fact an apostle; the "passenger" in Peter's barque, the non-active layman, must become an exception and an abnormality.

Layfolk have no reason to be diffident in this matter, for the very highest Authority urges them to come forward and take their share in the Church's work. In his first great Encyclical on "The Peace of Christ in the Kingdom of Christ," His Holiness Pope Pius XI. made a special commendation of Catholic Action, under which heading he included apostolic work of the laity for young people, and the promotion of the Sodalties of Our Lady. Since then, His Holiness has insisted again and again on the necessity for well-regulated Catholic Action on the part of the laity. In an address to university students in 1929, the Pope defined Catholic Action as "the participation of the laity in the Apostolic Hierarchy of the Church." His Holiness drew attention to the fact that Catholic Action is as old as the Church herself, and pointed out that the Apostle St. Paul in the commendations and salutations at the end of his Epistles was addressing, not bishops and priests, but layfolk "who have laboured with me in the Gospel."

Again, in his recent Encyclical on "The More Extended Use of the Spiritual Exercises," the Pope gives his emphatic support to lay co-operation with the clergy:

With no less care, Venerable Brethren, would we have the manifold cohorts of the Catholic Action polished or

cultivated fitly by the Spiritual Exercises. With all our power, we desire to promote this Action; and we cease not, and never will cease to commend it; because the co-operation of the laity with the apostolic hierarchy is exceedingly useful, not to say necessary.

Thus the Holy Father himself calls on all his children to throw themselves whole-heartedly into the work that is to hand. The problem has long been familiar, and calls ever more instantly for a solution. Whatever the solution be, it must be provided by lay co-operation. The method of solution which has been outlined in this article has had such striking results in practice, that a very clear indication seems to be given of the lines to be worked on in the future. The facts given show a promise fulfilled in one parish, and a promise eminently well worth working for in every parish in the land. Here is the layman's work *par excellence*; who will take it up?

When I asked my parish priest if he really meant that *none* of his boys had been lost, he said: "Humanly speaking, I know that all of the 200 to 300 boys in this parish are in the grace of God." What this really means only the tongues of angels could describe; the shining splendour of that company of Christian knights in a north-country industrial town is beyond all worldly ken, but one is wistful for the splendour and the glory of this living faith to spread through all the land, so that in every parish in the country it may be said: They are all in the grace of God, "and where sin abounded, grace did more abound" (Rom. v. 20).

J. LEYCESTER KING.

THE CLASH OF PRINCIPLES IN ANGLICANISM

II

RIGHTLY considered, the theory of Comprehensive-ness, to which Anglicans recur with more or less complacency when faced with the fact of the fundamental doctrinal differences in their communion, is an abandonment of any real claim to be the Church of Christ, a competent exponent of the revelation made by and through God Incarnate. His Church was founded in order to teach all religious truth and equipped with the means of doing so. Comprehensive-ness is an invention designed to obscure the radical differences between Elizabeth's creation and the Catholic Church which it supplanted;—a Church which certainly taught with authority and exacted, on penalty of excommunication, obedience to her teaching. Allowing private interpretations of the Bible and the Creed, clothing, in many cases, its own standards of belief in designedly ambiguous language, the Elizabethan Church was a scandal to Christianity from the first, failing to bring home to its members the high and clear revelation of Christ, and offering little help to those, who, moved by His threats and promises, sought to learn definitely the truths of salvation. Having officially disclaimed the divine prerogative of infallibility wherewith God Incarnate had endowed His Church, it showed itself a man-made institution, deriving legal coherence and stability only from the civil authority, and destined inevitably to fall to pieces once that support is removed. A Church that, ignorant of the meaning of revelation and so disowning any capacity or authority to teach it, calls itself "comprehensive," does not really conceal its impotence by so doing. Can we imagine a secular institution, like the Carlton Club, for instance, in order to enlarge its membership, adopting the theory of comprehensiveness, and allowing one section of its members to profess Liberal principles and another those of Labour? Would not its political standing be immediately destroyed? Yet in the immensely more important matter of religious faith, here is a body forced to retain antagonistic elements within its system because it

cannot decide which is right, and, even if it could, has no means of ejecting those found unorthodox. This fundamental weakness of Anglicanism needs to be insisted on, for it is the "lie in the soul" which perverts the whole understanding of that body and prevents it from even realizing its pitiable state.

We have been dwelling on recent episcopal declarations of this suicidal theory, since it is Anglicanism of to-day that is our theme. But the theory is as old as Anglicanism itself, as the XXXIX Articles show. And, a few generations ago, at the first Pan-Anglican Synod of 1864, the Bishop of Lincoln (later of London) declared, as does the Bishop of Durham to-day (*THE MONTH*, May, p. 390), regarding the doctrine of the Christian priesthood and sacrifice, in the very presence of the Ritualists who held it, that

"there is absolutely no support for it in Anglican formularies,"

moreover, that

"the Puritan triumph in the seventeenth century was not more disastrous than would be a pseudo-Catholic triumph now."

Yet he made no attempt to have the Ritualists expelled, and, in Convocation the succeeding year, another Bishop, Dr. Wilberforce, explained why. "The Church of England [he said] had always within herself persons of extreme divergencies of doctrine . . . a fact as inevitable as having different countenances on different men." It would follow that the Church of England is not the Christian Church known to St. Paul, who would have anathematized even an Angel from Heaven preaching another Gospel than that which he was commissioned to proclaim. At the same meeting of Convocation the Bishop of Ely corroborated his brother Bishop. "In all times [he said] since the Reformation the people had been allowed to hold extreme doctrines on the one side and on the other," and "he hoped the time would never come when they would not be allowed to do so." That seemed to be the general view of the House, and the President, Archbishop Tait, only expressed the logical result when he summed up by saying,— "As to divergencies of opinion among the clergy, I do not wish to restrain or curb the liberty of the clergy." We must remember that in Anglican phraseology, "faith," "opinion," and "view" are convertible terms. At the time of the Bennett judgment (1872) the *Manchester Examiner*¹ raised the peren-

¹ Quoted in *The Tablet*, June 15, 1873.

nial question—"What is the religion of the Church of England?" and answered it thus, in quite modern fashion—

"At present the Church of England is an embodiment of three religions. It teaches one religion which can hardly be distinguished from Deism; another which is almost identical with Romanism; and another which may be defined as a sort of Calvinistic Methodism. All these three cannot be true, for any two of them are mutually contradictory; yet all three are being taught at the same time as equally authoritative, equally binding on the consciences of men."

In the last phrase the journalist exaggerates. To do the Church of England justice she teaches *nothing* as binding upon the conscience. She does not formally *profess* to teach.

We can best show this by quoting some further episcopal utterances on this all-important point, which, apart from any other consideration, doctrinal or historical, utterly invalidates the claim of Anglicanism to belong to the Church of Christ. In our previous paper some nineteen Anglican bishops bore implicit witness to the inability of their Church to reach and teach revealed truth: some of them are cited again in the following, together with additional members of that learned and outspoken Bench.

We may recall the protests made in 1918, on the score of his unorthodoxy, when the present Bishop of Durham was raised to the See of Hereford. The most vigorous of his assailants was the late Bishop of Zanzibar, who, after examining the new prelate's writings, pronounced judgment as follows:

"The Bishop of Hereford clearly teaches—

- 1) That the Virgin Birth is an open question,
- 2) That our Lord's Bodily Resurrection is an open question,
- 3) That our Lord's so called "nature" miracles are not facts,
- 4) That the Fourth Gospel must not be read as history,
- 5) That our Lord made mistakes in His teachings, believed some things that are not true, and prayed to His Father about demons who do not possess men as He supposed. . .

The Archbishop of Canterbury, on February 2, 1918, [the date of the Bishop's consecration] authorized these teachings as legitimate within the Church. Associated with the Primate in this authorization were the Bishops of Durham, Lincoln, Southwark, Birmingham and Peterborough." Bishop Frank Weston, *The Christ and His Critics*, 1919, (p. 151).

The "Anglo-Catholic" address to the Orthodox, mentioned in our previous paper (*THE MONTH*, May, p. 390), as condemned for disingenuousness by the Bishop of Durham, admits "comprehensiveness" only to disavow it :

"As an earnest of our mind, we venture to place in your hands a copy of a Declaration of Faith signed by our famous theologian and Bishop, Dr. Gore, and 3,000 Anglican Bishops and priests, as an exposition of what they hold to be the official teaching of the Anglican Church. It is true that amongst us there are *other voices*, but we believe that this document represents the historic witness of our Communion both for the past and for the present." Address of the Anglo-Catholic pilgrims to the Orthodox Patriarch of Alexandria, *Christian East*, June, 1924.

Yet Bishop Gore, the chief signatory to the above, in a *Times* letter quoted above (*THE MONTH*, May, p. 391), accepts as fellow Anglicans those who would utterly repudiate that "Declaration of Faith." He writes :

"... I quite understand and rejoice in the comprehensiveness which would leave within our boundaries 'parties' which would reasonably be called Catholic, Protestant and Modernist." *Times*, 19.9.28.

Archbishop Lang of Canterbury, whilst deprecating uniformity of worship, pleads for the establishment of legal limits; not yet, after the lapse of more than three and a half centuries, existent :

"Doubtless the belief that a rigorous uniformity can or ought to be enforced in the worship of God has gone. . . But some law of worship and of the administration of the Sacraments, however generous in its limits, some law acknowledged by bishops and clergy alike, some law whose authority will command the conscience of all, there ought to be in the Church of England. Towards the framing of such a law we must still quietly and patiently direct our minds." Speech in the Lower House of Convocation, *Times*, 12.7.29.

Bishop Woods of Winchester deprecates attacks on "Anglo-Catholics," saying, "the best cure for false doctrine is not persecution, but persistent propagation of true doctrine." St. Paul taught otherwise. "The man that is a heretic, avoid." Here are the Bishop's words.

"The Home Secretary and his friends appear to regard Anglo-Catholics as barely tolerable. There seems to be nothing for them but politely to show them the door. That on occasion some had

been unwise, extravagant, or provocative no one knows better than the Bishops, but have they not a vital and rightful contribution to make to many sides of the life of the Church? Have not the Church and our common Christianity been deeper and richer for what they were and taught? Can we afford to treat harshly, if not unfairly, a group of men who, whatever their faults and extravagances, have brought home to thousands a new perception of the divine and supernatural?" Speech at Diocesan Conference, *Times*, 8.6.28.

The same prelate has his own way of dealing with law-breakers. Are boundaries being overstepped? Extend them!

"... Comprehension has its limits. The way to deal with a movement some of whose adherents have overstepped those limits is, not to attempt to confine it within ancient landmarks, but to move the boundary fences so as to include what in view of history and experience is reasonable and allowable, and to exclude what is undesirable in the light of the New Testament, and the standards of the Church." *Times* letter, 13.6.28.

Bishop Forster Garbett of Southwark, although not in general sympathy with the "Anglo-Catholics," will not have them extruded from the Church, lest it should lose its cherished comprehensiveness. He writes:

"Our Church has been the most comprehensive in Christendom; within its borders Evangelicals, Liberals, and Anglo-Catholics have lived and worked side by side. . . The new Prayer Book recognized fully this comprehensiveness, it sought to find room in our public worship for much that each school of thought had learnt through experience to value. . . No secret was made by the opponents of the Book both within and without the House of their conviction that the Anglo-Catholics had no place within the English Church, and that the Bishops had failed in their duty in not expelling them from it. There is little doubt that this attack will be pressed home in the months in front of us. If it is successful it will destroy the comprehensiveness of the Church of England and drive out large numbers of its most devoted and self-sacrificing members. I am no Anglo-Catholic. . . I admit fully that among the Anglo-Catholics there are some who will never be happy in the Church of England, and who by their disobedience and eccentricities have brought discredit on the movement with which they are associated." *Southwark Diocesan Gazette*, quoted in *Times*, 21.6.28.

There is some suspicion of "Reunion All Round" in the reflections of Bishop David of Liverpool after the rejection of the Revised Prayer Book. Anglicanism needs to be even more comprehensive:

"The Anglican communion is the broadest, the most widely

inclusive of all Protestant bodies in the world. We inherit a tradition of comprehensiveness, and I believe we desire to remain comprehensive. We recognize that our worst mistakes in the past have been those in which groups and bodies of men were allowed, and even encouraged, to pass out and separate themselves from the Church, so that its borders were narrower now than they need be. . . It is plain that God has for the Church of England of this generation a place to take and a part to play in His great purpose for the world which no other Church can take or play, because no other Church is wide enough. . ." Sermon in Liverpool Cathedral, 17.6.28.

Bishop Kempthorne of Lichfield, won't believe in any serious divisions in Anglicanism; still, he speaks of a "common stock," presumably of religious beliefs, to which various schools contribute, without anyone seeming to accept the finished product: for the "schools" remain distinct. These are his Lordship's words:

"I know there are some who say that Catholic Christianity and Protestant Christianity are really different religions, and that any union of them is hopeless. I wholly disagree. . . Of course, there are real differences, but, if there is more mutual explanation and less polemic, more positive teaching and less negation, it will be found that schools of thought which seem to be opposed to one another have each their contribution to make to the common stock. . .

Each diocese [says a Missionary Bishop] needs the support of the others: each needs the balance which comes from contact with men of other schools: each has a contribution to make to the whole which never can be made in isolation." *Lichfield Diocesan Magazine*, quoted in *Times*, 31.5.29.

The reason why the Bishop disclaims religious division becomes more intelligible when we read his definition of religious unity, for he considers it to be merely the spirit of mutual tolerance. He had hopes that the "wide liberty and inclusiveness which characterized the New [Prayer] Book" would make for greater unity, and this is what he takes for unity:

". . . the unity which came when men who held strongly to their own convictions were prepared to respect the convictions of those who differed from them, and to work with them in harmony and good will." Speech at Lichfield Diocesan Conference, 15.6.27.

It appears that the Bishop seeks no more real unity for his Church than inspires for the time being a Government commission, composed of all parties, to examine some subject of national concern.

Bishop Perowne of Bradford merely reiterates the old baseless boast that the compromises which keep Anglicanism together do not involve principle. Speaking at a Diocesan Conference at Keighley he said :

"The new Prayer Book exemplifies the genius of the English Church for the right kind of compromise, which can be effected without loss of principle to varying schools of thought. . . . The new Book makes explicit what has been implicit in our historical position for three centuries, as a Church embodying three distinct schools of thought." *Times*, 1.6.28.

Bishop Headlam of Gloucester, in view of those often appealed to but elusive limits, threatens the perverse "Anglo-Catholics" with the wrath of the "English people," an entity which remains, nevertheless, supremely indifferent to all that agitates those zealous folk :

"The English people are very patient and long-suffering. They have borne with even the extravagance of the Anglo-Catholic party, but quite clearly there is a limit to their patience. There are signs that that limit is being reached. If they found that a section of the clergy were not prepared to conform loyally to the limitations—very wide limitations—which had been granted, there might be a strong and dangerous reaction, and much more that the clergy valued might be in peril." Visitation Charge, *Times*, 6.4.27.

Bishop Woods of Winchester, who does not fear that the Archbishops' Commission of Doctrine will make the English Church less comprehensive—he reminded Convocation (*Times*, 11.7.28), of that Commission and said its decision on the Eucharist was "more likely to conduce to inclusion than to exclusion"—rather disingenuously confounds comprehensiveness with Catholicity, but draws the line at the Romanizing practices of the "Anglo-Catholics." Like so many of his brethren, he shows in his final sentence that he thinks the Catholic Church does not actually exist at present, but may come into being at some future Pentecost :

"The Anglo-Catholics, among whom I count some of my best friends, are in danger of taking a wrong turning and of hindering the causes which they are most anxious to promote. In precisely these directions, it seems to me, Latinism tends to lead them astray, and, just in so far as they yield to this undeniable attraction, in that degree the prospect of that return of the English nation to an ordered and comprehensive Christianity which is Catholicism, is deferred. . . . Nor do they always remember the immense con-

cessions made by Evangelical supporters of the Book for the sake of that deeper Evangelical Catholicism which increasingly, we hope, will be the glory of the English Church. For if the Catholicism of the English Church is not at once scrupulously Scriptural and solidly based on sound knowledge, what contribution can she bring to the united Catholic Church of the future?" Letter to *Times*, 26.3.28.

Bishop Winnington Ingram of London elaborates that fanciful Anglican conception of religious truth being portioned out amongst various believers, so that it is not found as a whole in any one mind or even in their combination, but remains unrealized anywhere. Speaking at a diocesan meeting in St. Paul's the Bishop said :

"When people try to make out that the Church of England is a house divided against itself, I love to think of this service. Men of all schools of thought of the Church are here, including Anglo-Catholics, the Central Body, Evangelicals, and Orthodox Modernists. We need them all; we need that firm hold of sacramental truth which the Anglo-Catholics give; we need the evangelical zeal of the Evangelicals; and we need that appeal to reason ever kept before them by the Orthodox Modernists. . . ." *Times* report, 9.12.29.

And at an earlier period the same tolerant prelate rebuked Sir W. Joynton Hicks, now Lord Brentford, for his desire to commit the Church to his brand of Protestantism and thus limit her glorious comprehensiveness :

"But may I ask in conclusion what you and your friends are really aiming at? Is it to drive the Anglo-Catholics out of the Church of England? Do you want to repeat the awful mistake of our ancestors when they drove out the Wesleyans, to the great and lasting loss of the Church? . . . Is not the policy of our large-hearted Archbishop far wiser—to keep the Church of England truly comprehensive? No one wants to drive out those who are ultra-Protestant in doctrine and "receptionists" in their sacramental views. Cannot the people on your side be generous enough not only to keep within the Church of England but make happy in the Church of England those to whose work and devotion we owe so much?" Letter to *Times*, 17.5.28.

Bishop Whittingham of St. Edmundsbury and Ipswich does not mind alterations in the Prayer Book worship, unless they seem to look towards Rome. His comprehensiveness is one-sided, yet, to his credit, he disavows the Continuity myth :

"There are variations to-day which are quite in accord with the spirit of the Prayer Book, but others are widely removed from its

spirit, with services and practices which are really a return to mediæval practice and involve the virtual repudiation of those distinctive notes given to the Prayer Book which definitely marked off the Anglican from the Roman communion. There is not the remotest intention of the Church to go back on those distinctive notes or to compromise, and I cannot put myself in the position of being supposed to give any kind of sanction to those practices." Speech at Diocesan Conference, *Times*, 23.5.25.

Bishop Swayne of Lincoln, ignoring, like the rest of them, that contradictories cannot both be true, would like even more latitude than the Revised Book allowed :

"I personally would have welcomed it more warmly if the enrichment had been greater and the latitude permitted wider, but because I do not get all I want I am not disposed to reject what is actually given. There are those who blame the Book because it permits variety of usage, especially in the celebration of Holy Communion, but for that very reason I welcome it, for it seems to me in the highest degree dangerous that we should allow ourselves to think that one precise form or set of words is alone adequate to express the mysteries of God." Diocesan Conference, 1928.

Bishop Strong of Oxford considers that it is the mind that makes truth, or, at any rate, that even revealed truth must be modified in some way in order to satisfy different mental or temperamental requirements :

"If we do not do something of that kind [he is speaking of Prayer Book Revision] those taking various points of view in the Church will gradually fall apart and there will be a split. That would be a disaster, not only to the Church of England, but to the world, because the Church of England has done something like what the nation has done in politics. It has found out a way by which a number of persons who do not necessarily agree on certain questions can live and work together, and that is what we want in regard to the Christianity of the world. All over the world we have religious people of every conceivable kind of mind wanting religion, and the religion of Christian truth will be found to satisfy all the various kinds of mind. It will fail if we tie it up with some single aspect of transient controversy in which we happen to take some particular view." Speech at High Wycombe, *Times*, 26.5.27.

Bishop Linton Smith of Hereford thinks that the success of the Protestants in twice rejecting the Revised Prayer Book bodes ill for comprehensiveness. He, too, thinks that the "people of England" are interested in the vicissitudes of Anglicanism :

"In my judgment the most serious aspect of the rejection is the

blow which has been dealt to the comprehensiveness of the Church of England. The Elizabethan settlement intended and provided for comprehension; and from that time there have always been the three great strains of religious life, the Evangelical, the Catholic, and the Liberal, each exercising an influence of varying weight at different times in the Church's history. Each has contributed richly to the life of the Church, and each should receive frank recognition of its legitimate position. . . . I find it hard to believe that the innate sense of fairness of the English people will in the long run rest content with such a verdict. . . . Time must show whether the people of England really wish for a one-sided settlement, or whether they will learn to try and meet the desires of all loyal members of the Church." *Diocesan Magazine*, quoted in *Times*, 2.7.28.

Bishop Warman of Chelmsford (now of Manchester) thinks, apparently, that religious faith is to some extent, composed of dislikes and prejudices, and so varies with "temperament": therefore, he advocates mutual tolerance in the interests of peace. He is speaking, of course, of the Prayer Book:

"If the acceptance of this Book means disloyalty to truth, refuse it we must; if, on the other hand, acceptance simply means the shedding of some of our prejudices, and, putting it at its worst, the acceptance of the prejudices of some other people, refusal will be indeed perilous. It will be a dangerous thing if we turn over its pages simply to discover whether the things we dislike are included or the things that we desire shut out, forgetting altogether that, within the unity of the family of God and the ambit of truth, the desires and dislikes of other people deserve our consideration." *Diocesan Chronicle*, quoted in *Times*, 8.4.27.

Archbishop Lang of York (now of Canterbury), whilst avowing that the spirit of compromise ruled the revision of the Prayer Book, claims that it was fair to all parties, as inclusive as the Church itself, and, once more, states without defining, those intangible "limits," and implies that the individual may choose what he is to believe:

"Our desire has been to secure not compromise for the sake of peace, but rather comprehension for the sake of truth, of the fullness and richness of the one fellowship of faith and life. Of course, that fellowship, if it is to be real, must have its limits—the limits set for us by the special history and traditions, within the Church Catholic, of the Church of England.

It cannot be expected that what is now proposed will be acceptable to all. Individuals and groups within the Church will probably view parts of it with dislike or disappointment. Speaking for my-

self, there are things included which I would rather have excluded, things excluded which I would willingly have included. But let the test of our proposals be not whether they go beyond or fall short of what any party would desire, but whether they give a fair and generous place to each and all—a place which will strengthen and not strain that fellowship in one Body to which we are called." Speech introducing Second Revised Book to Church Assembly, *Times*, 27.4.28.

Bishop Hensley Henson solves the difficulty by distinguishing between what is thought privately and what is taught publicly, taking worship as a form of teaching,—a distinction which seems to strike at the root of religious honesty : we must remember once more that in Anglicanism "faith" equals "opinion" :

"It is the wisdom of the Church of England to permit large liberty of theological opinion. In the circumstances of the modern world that policy seems equitable and eminently sound. Limits to such liberty, of course, there must be, but that it should be ample, I trust Bishop Gore himself allows. All sections of Anglicans need, and enjoy, that generous toleration of private opinions. But when we pass from thought and teaching to the conduct of public service, we pass from a region in which individual liberty is the very condition of efficiency to a region in which it is the negation of justice and the principle of anarchy." Letter to *Times*, 18.5.25.

Archbishop Temple of Canterbury it was that, by his Charge of 1898, suggested the above distinction to the Bishop, in a passage which excellently illustrates our contention that Anglicanism does not even pretend to do what Christ instituted His Church to do—expound with authority the revelation of God. Her ministers speak as private individuals and their hearers believe them or not as they choose. Here we have it all in black and white : the outward ceremonial must be uniform, the underlying belief may be what you please.

"The large tolerance of diversity in opinion in the Church, as contrasted with the strictness of the Church in regard to ceremonial, has certainly tended to make many believe that they have a right to claim the same freedom in the one as in the other. If they may teach, why may they not also illustrate that teaching by ceremonial which seems to them appropriate for the purpose? But to this the answer is plain. It is the unity of the ceremonial that makes the diversity of opinion possible. The ceremonial stands before us as the order of the Church ; the teaching is, and must be to a very large extent, the voice of the individual. The ceremonial is for all alike ; the clergyman and the layman are alike

bound by it; but when the clergyman is in the pulpit the layman is not bound by what is said in his hearing. The layman has a right to exercise his private judgment. Both clergyman and layman are within defined limits free, but the freedom of the clergyman would soon become impossible if the same latitude were allowed in the ceremonial as in the preaching." Charge of 1898, quoted by Bishop Henson in *Times*, 18.5.25.

Bishop Neville Lovett of Portsmouth holds that comprehensiveness prevents stagnation—a fatal complaint which afflicted the Church for generations after 1662,—and that the changes in the Revised Prayer Book both provided the requisite changes and kept within those nebulous and necessary limits so often alluded to but never determined. He said:

"Whatever the fate in Parliament of the New Prayer Book, it does accurately represent the true doctrine and the wide spiritual hospitality of the Church of England as that Church was visualized and shaped by the divines of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Limits we must have, but that those limits are outraged by the Book is a proposition which, if successfully maintained, would reduce the Church of England to a spiritual stagnation as fatal as that which held the Church in its grip for four generations after the passing of the present Prayer Book of 1662." Speech to Diocesan Conference, *Times*, 20.4.28.

Archbishop Lord Davidson, the close of whose distinguished career is announced as we write, strove always to make Anglicanism as comprehensive as possible (see *THE MONTH*, May, p. 388). He, too, bears witness to the common Anglican belief that "likes and dislikes," "temperament," "sympathy," and other irrational emotions have a legitimate place in what one should accept as Christian faith. Speaking on the Prayer Book in the Assembly, he said:

"No one of us, Bishops, clergy, or laity, will say of it that it meets all criticisms, or perhaps even that it meets in every particular his or her own personal likes or dislikes. I certainly could not myself say so. But we believe it to be a well-balanced, as it certainly is a well-considered, proposal. It aims at being comprehensive in the sense of meeting the desires of different groups of Churchmen varying in temperament, sympathy, and lines of thought within the wide limits of loyalty to the traditions and teaching of the Church. . . . I am glad the debate this afternoon has taken place. I want the Church to be in the fullest sense comprehensive. It has been my chief motive to get into the united fold many men who hold very widely different opinions." *Times* Report, 8.2.28.

Bishop Lord William Cecil of Exeter, like the other "Pro-

testants," thinks the new Prayer Book too comprehensive, and that, in the wrong direction. He feels that the English Protestant is being robbed of his rights.

"I am certain my fears are shared by a great majority of Church people. People love their Prayer Book, and they are miserable when it is touched. In the new Book they will find things which seem to have relations with Rome, and I have no doubt that the end of the controversy will be that the number of those who will go over to Rome will be increased. Why not join the Roman Church, when they have practically accepted all the characteristics of her worship?" Speech in Church Assembly, *Times*, 8.2.28.

Bishop Garbett of Southwark does not believe the Anglican Church is exclusively composed of "schools of thought": there is a vague and voiceless mass, apparently, which accepts traditional Protestantism without analysing its tendencies. But he is not averse to changes of doctrine, provided they are "authorized":

"The Church is far greater than the three parties which existed within it. The majority of its clergy, and a still larger section of the laity, would not call themselves either Evangelicals, Modernists, or Anglo-Catholics. In London, Southwark, and one or two other dioceses it might be possible to group half the parishes under one or other of the three party banners, but this could not be done in the country as a whole. By far the largest number of the parishes belong to the great central group which has no organization and no party cries. The steadying influence of the centre and the various shades of opinion which connected it with Evangelicals, Modernists, or Anglo-Catholics reduces the likelihood of schism on a large scale. . . . The advocates of substantial changes in worship should not carry into practice their proposals until they have been authorized by the Church. Their freedom to advance them by reasoned argument must not be regarded as equivalent to a licence to act as if they had already won their case. Theologians who demand some important doctrinal restatement as necessary may urge it both by voice and pen, provided they do not use their position as commissioned ministers of the Word to proclaim from the pulpit with official authority some private opinion or some uncertain speculation." Visitation Address, *Times*, 31.10.29.

It can hardly now be doubted that the Anglican "Note" of comprehensiveness, accepted with a show of conviction, by the "Anglo-Catholics"; acquiesced in, with more reserve, by the Modernists; rather resented by the Protestants; is destructive of its claim to be a constituent part of the Church of Christ.

It cannot deliver His message for it does not know it. It cannot assert even His divinity : it cannot say whether He is really present in the Eucharist : it regards the necessity of baptism as an open question : there is hardly any form of unbelief except, perhaps, the negation of God's existence, that does not find shelter in its comprehensive bosom : its prelates proclaim that there must be "limits" to divergence of doctrine but not one of them, nor the whole Bench of them, dare state *with authority*, what those limits are. Bishop Furze of St. Albans got as near to doing so as is possible in the circumstances when he wrote to the *Times*, 24.4.23 :

"The Church of England should to-day be true to its boasted tradition of comprehensiveness—which I personally believe in—but if that comprehensiveness is to be maintained, it must be adjusted to existing conditions and the only limits of such comprehensiveness are the limits of the truth, with its touchstones of Scripture and tradition. . . ."

but this leaves us where we were, for Scripture, individually interpreted, is no standard at all, and who shall say what Anglican tradition is? The Bishops make the best of a bad job but by their acceptance as normal and desirable of three main, yet discordant, "schools of thought" dividing their system—to omit reference to the Central Body, whose belief is unknown because never voiced—they equivalently tell the world that no individual member of their Church can be more than one-third of an Anglican, since each "school" maintains its distinctiveness by denying the claims of the other two. Why should we so insist on what is so notorious—the comprehensiveness of Anglicanism? Simply because as Catholics we have to bear witness to the truth and therefore to unmask error wherever found, if only out of kindness to the deceived. Furthermore, as forming the Catholic Church in this land, we are dispossessed of our heritage, and should be false to our traditions if we did not continually assert our claims by showing up the religious incapacity of the body that has usurped our place. The pre-Reformation Church in England was a teaching Church, as is the Catholic Church here to-day : the Elizabethan Church and its modern descendant, Anglicanism, is notoriously and confessedly not a teaching Church. And, therefore, not the Church of Christ. It is our duty to press home that point, for on it lies the salvation of many souls.

JOSEPH KEATING.

RELICS, AUTHENTIC AND SPURIOUS

II

TO cast doubt upon the authenticity of relics which for some hundreds of years have been held in veneration is always an invidious task. Such seeming iconoclasm must inevitably excite protest and may often produce a certain resentment among good people whose susceptibilities one has not the least wish in the world to wound. It would be immensely more satisfactory if one felt able to vindicate the traditions which have been handed down from earlier ages and which in many cases seem to have been confirmed by papal pronouncements and accepted without question by saintly men whom everyone honours. To take up the position that the *sensus fidelium* is justified not only in dogmatic matters but in their devotions and historical beliefs would enormously simplify the whole problem of Catholic apologetic, if only such a line of defence were possible. But unfortunately it is not possible, and the action of the Holy See itself has proved the impossibility to demonstration. To take a single example, the baptism of Constantine by Pope Sylvester and the subsequent donation to the papacy by the Emperor of a vast temporal jurisdiction, were beliefs accepted throughout Christendom for centuries, without a single voice being raised in protest. The story of the Emperor's leprosy with its fantastic details was recounted in the lessons of the Roman Breviary, and the donation of Constantine, though by no means so much use was made of it as the assailants of papal authority have pretended, was nevertheless appealed to in official documents by more than one of St. Peter's successors. It was only in the fifteenth century that doubts began to be expressed, and it was not until more than a hundred years later that the more extravagant features regarding the alleged baptism were removed from the Breviary.¹

If so many earnest Catholics are sensitive about the sceptical tone which is now more and more manifest in our scholarly reviews and works of reference, it is, I venture to say, because the reading of such good people has not brought them into

¹ It is still stated in the Breviary that Constantine was baptized by Pope Sylvester, but it is certain, as every historian now admits, that the Emperor received baptism from Bishop Eusebius of Nicomedia after Sylvester's death.

contact with mediæval habits of thought. They have no conception how uncritical even the holiest and most learned of ecclesiastics in past ages were apt to be, how readily the miraculous explanation was preferred to the natural one, how invariably the extravagant story with preposterous details was welcomed in place of a sober narrative which contained nothing marvellous, and how entirely the wish was the father to the thought when they had to pronounce upon the genuineness of notable relics which brought credit and an influx of pilgrims to the church which was fortunate enough to possess them. So far as regarded relics in particular there was, practically speaking, no possibility of disproving a tradition once established. The attestations accepted in those days—we have specimens still surviving—consisted of no more than a label with a name, and if any doubt was felt for a while whether the precious object was really what it purported to be, it needed only the lapse of a few years to convert the attribution into an established certainty. The readiness with which an alleged relic was accepted may be illustrated by a typical incident in the Life of St. Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury and Doctor of the Church, rightly held to be not only one of the holiest but also one of the most learned and experienced men of his day.

At some time in 1106, while St. Anselm was at Rouen, the famous Bohemund,¹ one of the great leaders in the Crusades, came there with his chief of staff, whose name was Ilgyrus. This Ilgyrus, who was devoted to St. Anselm, and who apparently had at one time been his pupil, discoursed to the Saint of his experiences in the East, and told him among other things of the relics which he had brought back, explaining also how he had come to acquire them.

Amongst these relics [so Eadmer tells us], he prided himself particularly on certain hairs of our Blessed Lady, which he said had been given him by the Patriarch of Antioch, whilst he was commanding under Bohemund in that city. "These hairs," he went on to explain, "I should never have dared to accept, if I had not been prompted to do so by the love of that land in which I had been born and brought up. For I hoped that I should

¹ Bohemund was the son of Robert Guiscard. The portrait which Anna Comnena has left of him in her "Alexias" is by no means entirely a pleasant one. In her eyes he was false and utterly unscrupulous. See Mrs. Buckler's "Anna Comnena," especially pp. 469—478.

some day return home and should be able to shed lustre upon my country by the bestowal of such a treasure. Seeing then that with God's protection I have not been disappointed in my hope, I have determined to give two of the hairs to this church (Rouen) which holds the primacy of Normandy, two to the abbey of SS. Peter and Ouen, two to the monastery of the same Blessed Virgin (at Bec) in which under thy fostering care I was brought up to man's estate, and two of them finally to thee. For there were twelve in all given me by the said bishop, who affirmed that they had been torn out by Our Lady herself at the time when the sword of sorrow pierced her heart as she stood beside the cross of her Son. And this, the Patriarch declared, he had found attested in certain ancient records which they held to be of great authority, preserved in the archives of the church over which he presided."

St. Anselm, Eadmer goes on to tell us, was enraptured (*admodum exhilaratus*) at these tidings. As the precious relics had been left behind at Chartres, a band of monks was sent as an escort to fetch them and the Saint, together with the Archbishop of Rouen and all the canons and clergy of the city, went out to meet them in solemn procession. Four of the hairs were taken to Bec, two of which were given to the Abbey, while Anselm reserved the other two for himself, placing them under Eadmer's personal charge.

They remain in my care [adds Eadmer] to this day. What other people may think about them, I cannot say. But this I know for certain, that my lord and reverend father, Anselm, always held them in deep veneration, and also that I myself by time-hallowed experience have felt that there is something in them of marvellous sanctity which all the world would do well to recognize.¹

Now I hope I shall not seem perversely sceptical if I confess that I cannot bring myself to believe in the authenticity of such a relic as that here spoken of. Not only is the idea of Our Blessed Lady tearing her hair as she stood beneath the cross absolutely repugnant to our conception of her as the Mother of the Redeemer submissive in all things to His holy will, but the subsequent collection of these individual hairs

¹ Eadmer, "Historia Novorum," Rolls Series, pp. 179-181.

from the trampled soil on Calvary is an incredible thing. Let us admit the good faith of Ilgyrus and of the Patriarch of Antioch, though the scruples of the former, only overcome by the thought of the service he was rendering to his country, do not make a very good impression, still what guarantee have we that in the thousand years which had elapsed since Our Lady lived on earth no one had been imposed upon? It would be no exaggeration to say that there were fifty or a hundred monasteries or churches in the Middle Ages which claimed to possess *crines Beatae Virginis*. The relics of the Blessed Virgin which were preserved in the royal abbey of Westminster are thus enumerated in the official inventory (15th century).

St. Edward, king and confessor, presented many pieces of the dress of the Blessed Virgin Mary, of the linen garment which she wove herself, of the window recess in which the angel stood when he saluted her, of her milk, of her hair, of her shoes, and of her bed; also the girdle (*zonam*) which she worked with her own hands and used to wear and which she left to St. Thomas at her Assumption. King Athelstan gave a certain veil of the holy Mary the Virgin. Offa, King of the East Saxons, presented a cypress and a piece of her tomb.¹

Exeter also, in a list sufficiently old to be preserved in an Anglo-Saxon translation, claimed to possess part of the dress of Our Lady and of her veil and of her hair ("of tham heafod clathe thaere ilcan Godes moder and of hire feaxe").² And scores of similar lists might be cited.

We are told, however, that at Antioch the Patriarch appealed to ancient documents. But were these any more reliable than the entries in the inventories quoted above? Unfortunately we know too much of the multitudinous apocrypha which had currency in the East, and of the trust which was reposed in the so-called "Acts" of martyrs, which in nine cases out of ten were no better than pious romances. Even in Western lands modern criticism has shown that the vast majority of the very early land charters and papal privileges, though they often purport to be the original instruments themselves and were produced as such both in the secular and ecclesiasti-

¹ Fleet, "History of Westminster," edited by Dean Armitage Robinson, pp. 69-70.

² Dugdale's "Monasticon," Vol. II., p. 530.

cal courts with seals attached to them, were unquestionably forgeries. There is no reason to suspect that this wholesale rejection of ecclesiastical "land-books" is motivated by anti-Catholic prejudice. The men who led the way in the science of "diplomats" were devout priests and Religious, like Mabillon and Papebroch. The tests applied are in many cases conclusive and no serious student dreams of disputing that the unfavourable judgments arrived at are in general quite reliable, even though here and there in individual cases a difference of opinion may exist.

But the devout and earnest people who so warmly defend what they regard as papal or Catholic traditions, have for the most part made no study of these things. If mention is made of documentary evidence, they think it irreverent to suppose that a presumably good and intelligent man like the unnamed Patriarch of Antioch could have been imposed upon. But when we find a Doctor of the Church like St. Anselm accepting, upon the mere word of the Crusader who brought it to him, so unlikely a relic as the hair which Our Lady tore from her head beneath the cross, surely the doubt must occur whether that unnamed Patriarch or his predecessors were likely to be more critical than the Saint whose learning so much impressed his contemporaries. Is it rash to suggest that in those intervening thousand years one prelate may have been simple enough to put trust in the representations made by some unscrupulous romancer? The paramount importance attached to relics, which often led to pitched battles being fought for their possession, supplied every motive for fraud, and once a relic had been accepted as possibly genuine, it became in a generation or two a priceless treasure to doubt which would be impious. During the early Middle Ages the fabrication of relics had grown into a regular business in the West.¹ Were the Greeks and Armenians and Syrians in the East more likely to be above reproach? In literary matters we know that they had no conscience at all. Can we suppose that those who so freely forged documents and were accused of breaking the most solemn oaths, would have drawn the line at the manufacture of counterfeit relics?

There was hardly any material object mentioned in the Gospels, or even in the Old Testament, which some church or other did not claim to possess. There was hardly any inci-

¹ See Jean Guiraud in "*Mélanges G. B. de Rossi*," pp. 73-95.

dent in Our Lord's life which, if we are to credit the data of mediæval inventories, had not left behind it some memorial for the veneration of Christians a thousand years afterwards. Our Saviour wept at the grave of Lazarus. We are asked to believe that the tears were gathered up by angels and preserved as relics. There was one at Sælincourt, for visiting which Pope Clement VI. granted an indulgence.¹ There was a still more famous tear at Vendôme, over which at the beginning of the eighteenth century a terrific controversy raged. The protagonists were two of the most distinguished ecclesiastics in France. On the one side was the Abbé J. B. Thiers who, seeing the crowds of pilgrims whom the relic attracted, took scandal and published a bitterly satirical indictment of the superstition encouraged, as he said, by the Saint-Maurist Benedictines of Vendôme for mercenary reasons. On the other side we find the great scholar Mabillon, who was constrained to write, though somewhat half-heartedly, in defence of his fellow Religious. It is true that Mabillon did not venture to maintain explicitly that the spindle-shaped crystal which was exhibited at Vendôme really did contain a tear shed by Our Lord. His line of argument was only to urge that the monks who first exposed it must have satisfied themselves that it was genuine, and to appeal to the example of St. Charles Borromeo who sanctioned at Milan the solemn procession held in honour of one of the holy Nails without making any sort of investigation into the authenticity of the relic, and who also, without historical inquiry, showed profound veneration for the holy Shroud now at Turin. I venture to suggest that those who are interested in the question of alleged New Testament relics will derive much profit from the article on the "Sainte Larme" published as recently as 1928 in the "Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie" (Vol. VIII., cols. 1382—1393) under the editorship of Abbot Cabrol, O.S.B., of Farnborough. No one can suspect that the dissertation written by Dom H. Leclercq in these circumstances is prompted by any malicious purpose of disparaging Mabillon. But Dom Leclercq makes it perfectly clear that in his judgment Mabillon was here on the wrong side, and that his argumentation evaded the real point at issue. It is noteworthy that long before the Abbé Thiers in 1699 delivered

¹ See de Riant, "*Exuviae Constantinopolitanae*," Vol. II., p. 162.

his attack, an "Histoire Véritable" had been published which professed to recount how the Sainte Larme had come to Vendôme in the days of the first crusaders, and also how seven miracles of recent date had vindicated its authenticity. But like the relics of Our Lady's milk and of Our Lady's hair, the "holy tears" were numerous. There was one at Saint-Maximin in Provence, though this claimed to have been shed by our Saviour when He was washing His disciples' feet. There was another tear at Saint-Pierre-le-Puellier in Orleans, another at Saint-Léonard de Chemillé in Anjou, and yet another at Thiers in Auvergne, all of them objects of great devotion.

Can we say that in such an atmosphere as this it was wise for holy bishops, whose example was followed unquestioningly by the devout laity, to take relics upon trust without any attempt at inquiry? St. Anselm's case certainly did not stand alone. Another bishop of an English See, famous not only for sanctity but for so much learning that he was the admiration of all his contemporaries, the holy Carthusian St. Hugh of Lincoln, hearing that a bone of St. Mary Magdalen was venerated among the treasures of the Abbey of Fécamp in Normandy, raised no question as to its authenticity. His chaplain and most trustworthy biographer, Adam of Eynsham, tells us how St. Hugh bit off two fragments of this bone when he paid a visit to Fécamp.

No one of the community [says Adam], neither the abbot nor any monk, had ever looked upon the relic itself divested of its coverings. For it was tightly sewn up in two silken cloths and one of linen. When the bishop begged urgently to see the bone and no one dared show it him, he borrowed a knife from one of his suite, cut the threads with which it was fastened, parted the coverings and reverently pressed it against his lips and his eyes. He tried to remove a fragment with his fingers, but when he could detach nothing, he brought to bear first his incisors and then his molar teeth. By this means he quickly broke off two pieces which he slipped into the palm of him who writes these lines, saying, "Keep these for me, dear friend."¹

The abbot and monks were rather scandalized at what they

¹ "Magna Vita S. Hugonis," Rolls Series, p. 317.

deemed his want of reverence, but the Saint defended himself on the ground that if he used his teeth to consume the Sacred Host at Mass, there could be no profanation in his treating the remains of Our Lord's followers with similar freedom.

Hardly any relic could be more open to suspicion than this alleged bone of St. Mary Magdalen. The investigation which during the past half century has been carried on by such scholars as Mgr. Duchesne, Dom G. Morin, the Abbé Vacandard, and G. de Manteyer, has utterly discredited the legends, all of them of relatively late date, which connect Saints Lazarus, Mary Magdalen, Martha, and their companions with the south of France. So far as we know anything of St. Mary Magdalen, her remains had been transferred from Ephesus to Constantinople in A.D. 899 by the Emperor Leo VI. There is not a shadow of foundation in early documents for the belief that the penitent of Bethany ever came to Provence. It is, as all authoritative works of reference now are agreed, a quite untenable legend. But this same relic, accepted by St. Hugh without the least misgiving, may remind us at the same time that something in the nature of an official verification did occasionally take place. As a rule this only happened when a dispute occurred. If the clergy at some centre of pilgrimage discovered that doubt was cast upon the authenticity of their own treasure, because a rival church claimed to possess the same sacred remains, the only thing to be done, seeing that the devotion and alms of the faithful were likely to be attracted elsewhere, was to appeal to ecclesiastical authority. Now the Abbey of Vézelay in Burgundy claimed to possess the body of St. Mary Magdalen. A privilege of Pope Stephen IX. in 1058 speaks of Vézelay as the place "where St. Mary Magdalen rests," the question of how she was supposed to have come there does not concern us. Unfortunately Saint-Maximin in Provence also claimed to be the last resting-place of the remains of the great penitent, and disconcerting rumours reached Vézelay in the thirteenth century that her body had been found there entire with the exception of one leg. The monks of Vézelay accordingly thought it necessary to substantiate their claim. In 1265 the bishops of Auxerre and of Panéas proceeded to conduct a verification. Though the whole skeleton was not discovered, certain important bones, including an arm and ribs, were forthcoming, and two years later, in 1267, a solemn translation took place, at which

St. Louis IX., the Cardinal-legate Simon and a number of bishops were present in state. Shortly afterwards the legate became Pope as Martin IV., and in 1281 he wrote to the Archbishop and Chapter of Sens, to attest the presence of the remains of St. Magdalen at Vézelay, recalling how he himself had assisted at the translation fourteen years earlier. But the clergy of the Sainte-Baume were not beaten. They appealed a few years later to Pope Boniface VIII., whom certain political influences had made friendly to Provence. He, after some sort of examination of the cause, decided in favour of the claims of Saint-Maximin. As G. de Manteyer remarks, "during nearly a century and a half the Popes had recognized that St. Mary Magdalen rested at Vézelay, but in future they will pronounce in favour of the Sainte-Baume." None the less modern research is now satisfied, after years of controversy, that no portion of her remains ever existed at either one place or the other.¹

As stated above there is hardly a single incident in our Saviour's life of which some concrete memorial was not preserved; that is, of course, if we could trust the mediæval relic inventories of the great centres of devotion. If there is any corner of the world in which we might expect authentic relics to have been gathered it would be the mother church of Christendom, the basilica of the Lateran, and in particular the chapel of the Sancta Sanctorum annexed to it, which bears the proud inscription—

NON EST IN TOTO SANCTIOR ORBE LOCUS.²

We possess the catalogue of these relics made in the eleventh century, and in our own day, after many hundred years during which no human eye had looked upon it, the treasury has been opened and the objects it contained have been photographed and minutely described. Here is the first list transcribed by John the Deacon, just as the more ancient catalogue worded it:

And there is the rod of Aaron which had blossomed, and the tables of the Testament, and the rod of Moses with which he twice struck the flint and the waters flowed forth. Also there are relics there of our Lord's cradle,

¹ A very full account of the Sainte-Baume controversy is given by Dom H. Leclercq in the "*Dictionnaire d'Archéologie*, etc.", under the word "Lazare."

² "There is not in the whole world a spot more hallowed."

and of the five barley loaves and the two fishes. Also the table of our Lord. The cloth with which He wiped the feet of His disciples. The seamless garment, which Mary the Virgin made for her Son our Lord Jesus Christ, which at His death the soldiers cast lots for, and it was never divided. So long as our Saviour shall preserve it here, no heresy or rupture of the faith shall last for any long space of time. The purple garment of the same Saviour and Redeemer. Two phials of the blood and water from the side of our Lord. The Circumcision of our Lord. The napkin (*sudarium*) which was over His head, which is one of the five linen cloths in which the body of the same Lord was wrapped. There is also there a fragment from the place where Christ ascended into heaven. Some of the blood of Saint John the Baptist. Some of the dust and ashes of the body of the same Precursor of Christ after it was burnt. His hair-cloth made of camels hair. A vessel full of the manna taken from the grave of St. John the Evangelist. The tunic of the same apostle and evangelist. When it was placed under the corpses of three young men they were restored to life, for their death had resulted from poison which they drank.¹

Of all these relics, that which was held in most veneration and most richly enshrined—the jewelled gold cross which contained it, though it has been badly injured, is still preserved to us—was one which does not in our day admit of discussion in a magazine for popular reading. Nevertheless, John speaks of the special honour paid to it. Instead of incensing it in the usual way they then commonly anointed it, and we are told how “every year this unction is renewed when the Lord Pope with his Cardinals goes in procession on the day of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross passing from the chapel of St. Lawrence into the basilica of the Saviour which is called the Constantinian basilica.” Unfortunately this relic was not unique. There were at least six other places which claimed to possess the same memorial. But this is not a matter which can be pursued here.²

¹ This document has been reprinted in Migne's *Patrology* (P.L., Vol. 78, c. 1383) from Mabillon's “*Museum Italicum*.” The list does not correspond with the details of the relics closely guarded in what was later known as the “*Sancta Sanctorum*.”

² See Father H. Grisar, “*Die römische Kapelle Sancta Sanctorum und ihr Schatz*,” pp. 59, and 92—96, and Leclercq in “*Dictionnaire d'Archéologie*,” etc., Vol. III., col. 1715.

It must not be supposed that the list cited above represents by any means all the objects of devotion preserved at the Lateran. The remnants of what were honoured in the twelfth century as Our Lord's sandals, with the silver casket which contained them, still exist. There were also in the same treasury one of the loaves used at the Last Supper, thirteen of the beans provided for the same paschal feast, part of the reed, and of the sponge which had been dipped in vinegar and held to our Saviour's lips, and a fragment of the sycamore tree into which Zachæus had climbed. With these of course were numerous other relics which had nothing to do with the Gospel history, the most important of these being what purported to be the head of St. Agnes, the Virgin Martyr. This is still preserved, together with the silver casket which Pope Honorius III. had made for it.

And while these memorials thus venerated in the mother church of Christendom under the shadow of the Pope's own palace would seem to claim special consideration because they were exhibited to pilgrims from all the world and were implicitly authenticated by pontifical authority, it must at the same time be said that almost every great place of pilgrimage in early ages presented similar collections which purported to be memorials of our Saviour's life on earth. Let me conclude with what Fleet tells us of this class of relics in the royal abbey of Westminster:

King Sebert who once restored this house presented relics of the straw which lay in the Manger of Christ, with fragments of the cross and of the sepulchre. Athelstan, the King, gave other relics of the cross, of the sepulchre of our Lord and of the mount of Olives and of Sinai. From King Ethelred, relics of the sepulchre, and the seal set on the Lord's sepulchre, of Thabor, Calvary and of Olivet, of the place where our Lord washed His disciples' feet, of the temple, and of the rust of our Lord's knife, of the fragments when He fed the 5,000, and of the myrrh and aloes with which He was anointed in the tomb. St. Edward King and Confessor made offerings from the cave wherein our Lord was born, from the manger and His cradle, from the frankincense offered by the Magi, from our Lord's table, from the bread which He blessed, from the chair where He was presented in the temple, from the desert where He fasted, from the prison

in which He was confined, as well as a large piece of the Holy Cross in a certain cross-reliquary beautifully chased, with other smaller pieces. . . . He also gave a large fragment of one nail, a piece of our Saviour's seamless garment, of the sponge, the lance and the strap with which He was crucified, of the sepulchre and of the stone which supported His head, and of the hills of Golgotha and Calvary. King Henry III. gave blood from the side of Christ which had been sent him from Jerusalem by the Patriarch Robert, also a thorn from Christ's crown, and a stone from the foot-print left when He ascended into heaven. Further he gave a considerable portion of miraculous blood.

It would be easy to quote many lists containing much more extravagant items, but with these examples before us taken from those centres, where if anywhere in the mediæval world we should look for official control and a rather higher level of intelligence, must we not say that those students have reason on their side who regard all very early relics with extreme distrust? No doubt when we are dealing with Saints of more recent date, in their own locality and with a continuous tradition in their favour, such suspicions would be out of place. There was in most cases no deliberate intention of deceiving, and it is possible that such memorials as fragments of rock from Thabor or Olivet were authentic. But the mediæval tendency was to believe if possible, and the fact that famous and extraordinary relics attracted crowds of worshippers must always have fostered that tendency in ecclesiastics who were jealous of the prestige of their own particular church and were eager to add to its resources.

HERBERT THURSTON.

MISCELLANEA

I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES

SIGRID UNDSET: CATHOLIC NOVELIST.

IN 1928 Sigrid Undset was awarded the Nobel prize for Literature. In 1925 she had become a Catholic; in 1920-22 she had published the three volumes "The Garland," "The Mistress of Husaby," and "The Cross" that make up the novel "Kristin Lavransdatter," now published as one volume in an English translation.

I am not concerned here with her earlier works, though one, at least, "Jenny," has appeared in England. I am concerned with Sigrid Undset as a Catholic writer and, although, as has been seen, "Kristin Lavransdatter" was published before she entered the Church, from its publication she must be counted as one.

"Kristin Lavransdatter" is an historical novel of the fourteenth century, the scene of which is laid in Norway. "The Master of Hestviken," of which three volumes have appeared and a fourth is promised, is an historical novel of a slightly earlier period but dealing with the same country. Thus baldly can we sum up her work: so one might say Shakespeare wrote such and such plays, and Dante the Divine Comedy. I do not, of course, suggest that Sigrid Undset is the equal of these, but I do say that, if any writer of our time is great, it is she; and it is no disparagement of her genius to say that without Catholicism she could not have been so great.

The Norway she re-creates for us is a Catholic Norway. The background of her Sagas is not, as in the case of so much modern literature, nature dwarfing to insignificance human life and destiny even whilst it hems them in, but the whole space of Eternity. The atmosphere of the supernatural, no mere background, with its light and air gives significance and substance to the people of whom she tells, and it is Catholicism that gives her this atmosphere. Without it her books, vast and psychologically interesting, vital, learned even as they are, would be still great, but with a diminished greatness; books for pathological study, depressing, interesting but sterile. However, as things are, there is violence and tragedy in them but they are not gloomy. "Kristin Lavransdatter" sinned and suffered, and life in the end left her stripped and alone but:

"A handmaiden of God had she been—a wayward, unruly servant, oftenest an eye-servant in her prayers and faithless in her heart, slothful and neglectful, impatient under correction, but

little constant in her deeds . . . the Lord and King who was now coming, borne by the priest's anointed hands, to give her freedom and salvation . . ."

"Freedom and Salvation!" The story of Kristin Lavransdatter is not a tragedy. Sigrid Undset has written of it but she has not ended it, she has only written the first chapter.

How many readers, I wonder, will be put off these books because labelled historical novels? We know the prejudice that prompts the saying—"an historical novel is a book that has ceased to be a novel without becoming history." The gibe cannot be made to refer to these Norwegian stories, which are placed in another age by their author because she is so at home there herself, so assured, that she can carry us with her without an effort. That she is the child of a great archæologist, soaked in the early history of Norway, is beside the point: without her enormous imaginative and psychological intuition, such an apprenticeship would not have carried her far. One lives with her as naturally in the thirteenth or fourteenth centuries as with other writers in our own. The amount of knowledge needed to have written these books is stupendous, but we have no sense of local colour mechanically laid on, no sense as of an overstaged theatrical production: as in "Jew Suss," for example. She is true to herself and true to human nature. Truth is the stuff of her books, the setting an accident.

That she can so trust herself to truth is what makes her greatness. Her picture of the Church in Norway in those days is convincing; one knows that it must be a true one, but it is not altogether a pleasant one. It was a wild and lawless time. Priests even and monks often took the colour of their age. She does not slur over their sinning. The faith itself was shot through with superstition and mixed with the dregs of pagan worship. She does not shirk the facts or explain or apologize for them. She trusts truth and it vindicates her. There is no need for her to point out to us that faith is a synthesis of the human and divine. Its divinity shines with so bright a lustre that poor little human shortcomings are seen only as specks of dust in the sunshine. Indeed we may truly feel that such superstitions, such paganism, such scandals, rooted as they are in the nature of humanity, are a less deadly element in that synthesis than the vulgar lukewarmness and materialism with which our own age is tainted. We have, with all our outward conformity, so much smaller a sense of the reality of the supernatural, we experience so much less our need of it.

To attempt to give an adequate sketch of the plot of "Kristin Lavransdatter" would be impossible. It is more like life than a story. Not that it is formless, but that it is on so vast a scale,

with so many strands interwoven that it is almost impossible, even as one reads, to take count of them all. Sigrid Undset is like a great producer whose "crowd" is not composed of "supers," but of actors each with a part to play. Individually they will not be remembered or perhaps noticed, but the ensemble will take on reality. To carry on the metaphor, Kristin Lavransdatter is not a star-part, the lime-light is not on her the whole time, but still she is the "lead," and she and her story are never submerged in a host of minor characters or of detail.

The first volume of the trilogy, "The Garland," is concerned mainly with Kristin from her early childhood till her marriage with Erlend Nikulanssön, the marriage she had sacrificed so much to accomplish and that was to bring to her and hers so much unhappiness. In it we meet the principal characters of the whole book, Erlend, Simon Darre and Lavrans, father of Kristin herself. We meet them as they were in their youth, and as the book grows, so do they, and time and circumstances and their own wills mould and change them in a way that is paralleled in no book that I know of. Grace, too, becomes almost visible, so that we see the hot-headed, upright, faulty Lavrans become, through it and suffering, something like a saint.

"The Mistress of Husaby" is the story of Kristin's married life. No quotation can give an adequate suggestion of the vitality of these books. They are compounded of so many elements and the whole is painted in with so many tiny touches. One would need more space than this Note affords to indicate by extracts the subtlety and serenity of Sigrid Undset's methods.

"The Cross," the third volume of the trilogy, brings us to the end of Kristin's sad and stormy life, or rather, as I have said before, not to the real end, but only to her death.

Of "The Master of Hestviken" I have not written, for there is still another volume to appear. It is a story in the manner of Kristin Lavransdatter, and has the same quality. Whether it is as great a book we must wait to decide till we have seen "The Son Avenger." We may say that it is written on the theme of the "Hound of Heaven," and that much greatness is already assured.

These books of Sigrid Undset break our hearts for the Norway of to-day and for all our modern life. A beauty seems to have gone from it that comfort and civilization cannot replace. The Norway of her books was so Catholic, so impregnated with the supernatural: to-day there are in all Norway only four priests native to the land. I feel Miss Undset has put us under an enormous debt of gratitude; we owe it to her to pray, if we can help in no other way, for the land that she loves.

M. MACKENZIE.

II. TOPICS OF THE MONTH

**The War-Mind
at the
Naval Conference.**

Regrets at the comparative failure of the Naval Conference must be tempered by the reflection that it has proved an invaluable means of educating public opinion as to the prerequisites for the establishment of international peace. The Conference had only a modified success because not all its members were convinced that world-peace, ruled by world-law, would be a greater advantage to each than any attainable, individual, benefit. Therefore, the debates were to some extent dominated by the spectre of possible future warfare, for the actual policies of the various nations lag far behind their solemn pledges. In a world which has abandoned war as an instrument of policy, there can be no need of armaments of any kind, except as international police forces. But in the Conference, each nation was arguing as if it meant to maintain its own police force, in sufficient strength to resist attack from the rest! The whole discussion about relative strength was based on the cynical conviction that no nation could be trusted to keep its word. And even the satisfactory Anglo-American-Japanese Agreement, which saves the waste of millions of pounds, is weakened by the proviso that it holds only if the unhappy rivalry between France and Italy does not result in an increase of *their* fleets. How precarious is the foundation thus afforded, recent events have tended to show. At the Conference, Italy was all for reduction, ready to go to all extremes if only she might remain as strong as the strongest Continental Power. Her spokesman assured the meeting—"We desire armaments to be purely defensive. Any initiative towards such an end will meet in my country with a sincere and cordial response." Yet within a week of that utterance, without waiting for any initiative, a year's programme of 42,900 tons of *new* naval shipping was announced by the Italian authorities, and, more recently, a series of bellicose speeches has been addressed to Italian troops by the Premier. As we said in our last issue, unless a political understanding is come to between these two Mediterranean Powers, France and Italy, unless they can determine that mutual war would be an incomparably greater disaster than any diplomatic defeat or loss of prestige that either might suffer for want of a stronger navy, unless, in a word, they realize that the risk they run through competitive armaments is far greater than any that might result from what at worst could only be a slight discrepancy of force in the Mediterranean, the progress of world-peace will be held up for generations, or for ever. Unhappily, Italy's ruler has made it a point of honour that her navy shall not be less than that of France, whereas France claims, on the grounds of greater defensive needs, a superiority of no less than 240,000 tons. Why, pending a political agreement which

would prevent competition, both parties should not reduce their fleets proportionately and relieve their overburdened taxpayers, passes reasonable comprehension. The fact that the *Osservatore Romano*, the only Italian paper which is free to state the moral standpoint, deprecates very frankly the present "militarist" campaign in Italy as a menace to international peace, plainly shows that Christian principles are in danger of being violated and emboldens other Christians to protest.

Italian
Common Sense.

At the same time we must confess that the speeches of Signor Grandi, the Italian representative, both at the Conference and since, have been more in accord with what must ultimately become the international mind, than those of his colleagues. He alone it was who actually proposed the abolition of battleships, though Mr. MacDonald expressed a desire to the same effect before the Conference opened. If that proposal had been carried, the meeting would have been a resounding success. No country would be less secure, were those sea monsters, the only object of which is to fight one another, and which call into being many other subsidiary craft, entirely abolished. They are obsolescent; the development of aircraft will shortly make them obsolete. All naval requirements can be more effectively fulfilled by 10,000 ton cruisers. Many distinguished admirals, notably Sir Herbert Richmond, have insisted on their comparative inutility and disproportionate cost. To scrap them would have been so easy and so safe that the rejection of Signor Grandi's sensible proposal must be put down to some obscure, and perhaps less worthy, motive. Speaking later in the Italian Chamber (May 9th), the Foreign Minister put a new complexion on the Italian demand for "parity" with France. His words are worth recording and remembering:

The conception of naval parity is in our conviction much more lofty and quite different from an arithmetical calculation of rival warlike forces. It is a principle of new international morality and law from which arises mutual trust between States, leading to elimination of suspicion and in consequence to effectual disarmament. On the other hand the principle of "absolute needs" is not in conformity with international solidarity and can only lead to an increase in armaments. Such a principle can only resolve the problem of security by an increase of armaments. In which case, I ask, where are the premises of peace and of trust as preached in the Pact of Paris?

And in concluding his speech Signor Grandi showed a welcome sense of the international importance of Franco-Italian friendship and collaboration, and an entire absence of that spirit of brag,

bluff and bluster, which in another quarter had done so much to cause the great war. M. Briand's plan for promoting the economic solidarity of Europe comes as an appropriate response to that speech.

Traffic in Arms.

A question in the House of Commons the other day disclosed the uncomfortable fact that British traders were contributing to the hostilities in China by supplying the combatants with tanks.

The answer was that there was no law against the trade, and that, if British firms did not supply the goods, foreign firms would. All the same the transaction seems rather legal than moral; like supplying a drunkard with beer on the plea that he can get it elsewhere. It will be remembered that a clause in the Versailles Treaty (Art. 8), bound the signatories to bring the private manufacture of arms under international control: owing to the immense financial power of the war-traders, acting sometimes through Navy Leagues and similar societies, little has been done in this matter. An international Convention to regulate Traffic in Arms was indeed drafted and signed by 35 nations on July 17, 1925. But alas! it was ratified only by six, Great Britain *not* amongst them, for this is a case where isolated action would be useless to effect any good. The world that had been almost destroyed by war and that had, by League and Pact, determined to renounce war lest worse should happen, has not been able to bring itself to abandon preparations for war. Or, to put it more exactly, those who made their living by war, were not prepared to give up their source of livelihood but rather strove to enlarge it. China, Russia, the Balkans, are flooded with weapons of destruction supplied by enterprising British, French, American, and, we believe, German firms, for this deadly trade knows no national barriers. We are glad to see that something is being done in the current Council of the League to put an end to this scandal: Great Britain proposes to call a Conference of the States concerned with a view to bringing the Convention of 1925 into speedy and simultaneous operation. But there will be a desperate struggle before the products of the Armament firms can be effectively "rationed." The retention of the useless battleship, the whole slow progress of disarmament, show what a tenacious strangle-hold "vested interests" have on the peace-movement.

The Ratification of the Agreement.

The London Naval Agreement has still to be ratified by the Powers concerned. It is opposed, here and abroad, only by those who think security lies in force rather than in mutual agree-

ment, and take no account of what has been done in this way, but general public opinion will not allow the solid, if too scanty, fruit of so much negotiation to be lightly thrown aside. Great Britain

occupies, rather aptly, a position in each of the three groups of Powers, whose interests lie respectively in the deep and narrow seas, and it is her interest to reconcile their points of view. The Premier's speech in the Commons' debate on the Treaty showed that he was fully conscious that his work for disarmament had only begun. None of his critics seemed to recognize the *necessity* of eliminating competition and reducing armaments; the unreality of their standpoint, indeed, furnished satisfactory evidence that the peace-movement has progressed. The debate in the American Senate is complicated by the cross-currents of politics and "Big Business." Many Senators have a rooted, probably hereditary, distrust of Great Britain; all are justifiably scandalized by the apparent inability of Europe to learn the lesson of the war and have done with quarrelling. Hence the intense reluctance to run any risk of being involved in such seemingly wanton disputes, for America, in spite of occasional "spreadingeagleism" is profoundly peace-loving. But peace cannot be had simply by being peaceful; it is the result of sustained effort against the tendencies that make for war. It calls for a constant readjustment of interests. It demands a readiness to make sacrifices, nay, even to fight, for the common good. In the very Covenant of the League is embodied an Article (No. XVI.) which enjoins upon the members to unite in coercing any State which violates its obligations. That Article was made one of the chief reasons for the refusal of the States to enter the League, because the distinction between war "as an instrument of national policy" and police action for the preservation of world-order was not fully recognized. Now it is evident that, by multiplied international engagements, "private" war has been practically abolished, and no law-abiding nation can be called upon to fight, except in defence of universal justice and peace. When that is fully understood in America, she will not surely hesitate to declare—what she has been strangely reluctant to declare hitherto—that no violator of the Kellogg Pact can count on her friendly neutrality, and thus not only solve the vexed question of the "Freedom of the Seas," but prove she is in earnest in her support of that great charter of the world's peace.

The need of an effective Catholic Foreign News-Agency, as well equipped and expeditious as is
The Maltese Agency, as well equipped and expeditious as is
Trouble. Reuter's, has been keenly felt by British Catholics since the ecclesiastical troubles in Malta began.

Even though they themselves are ready to wait for full and authentic information, convinced that highly-placed ecclesiastics would not take serious measures without very serious cause, nevertheless, non-Catholics, acting in the meantime on imperfect and biased reports, succeed in placing the Catholic authorities in a very invidious light; the attack is in full vigour long before the defences

can be organized. It is one of the minor inconveniences of belonging to a Church, universal in time and space, that the individual member is liable to be held accountable for the conduct of his brethren everywhere, in the past as well as in the present. That inconvenience would be avoided if some means could be found, short of the Universal Agency mentioned, whereby the explanation or justification of any contemplated ecclesiastical *coup d'état* could be furnished betimes to the Catholic press. The quarrel in Malta is the old one, which is always liable to occur between a spiritual supra-national power and the secular, nationalist State. One cannot, obviously, say beforehand which has right on its side, but one can say that in purely moral or mixed questions it is the Church's function to declare the truth. The Church in this country, for instance, determines that, whatever be the ideals and projects of the State, it cannot justly usurp parental right, nor deprive children of religious education. From the previous history of the Maltese dispute, it would appear that the Government attempted to overrule the right of a religious superior to settle the domicile of one of his subjects; the said subject, by his religious profession, having voluntarily surrendered his self-determination in the matter. What usurpation of ecclesiastical rights the Government has now been guilty of we can only conjecture from the extremely drastic counteraction of the hierarchy, which has given such occasion to the adversary, only too ready, to "blaspheme."

India.

It would not be fair to Mahatma Gandhi to estimate either his character or his aims from what the British press tell us of them. For he has declared war, of a sort, against the British Raj, and this repudiation of allegiance naturally colours all references to him in our home papers. To pass a final judgment one should know at first hand the condition, political, social and economic, of the swarming millions for whom he speaks. The British Raj has done much for them—how much remains to be done before life is tolerable? The land is still swept by famine: the small percentage of increase of population (1.2) in the last decennial period points to a terrible mortality. Like the destitute everywhere, the Indian ryot wants, first of all, sufficiency and security; if he clamours now for independence it is only because he has been persuaded that self-government alone can give him what he wants. It is not, in any case, for a free democracy to despise that persuasion. However, making every allowance for the sincerity of Gandhi's conviction that the British Raj stands between his countrymen and prosperity, he is clearly ill-advised in his campaign of revolt. Even when rebellion against established order is justified on other grounds, constitutional remedies should be tried first, and there should be some good prospect of success. On both these points Gandhi's position

is unsound. A Round-Table Conference to discuss Indian grievances has been summoned for October; there is the legal remedy which should be tried first. Again, the Indian political community is so variously and deeply divided that a Hindu ascetic, however estimable in himself, cannot presume to speak for all—for the millions of Mohammedans, the subjects of Native princes, and the hordes of casteless folk that make up the population of that vast continent called India. No doubt, the inhabitants as a whole want home-rule, or Swaraj in some form or other, and some responsibility for the present disturbance must be borne by those English politicians who, last year, grew so excited over the Viceroy's promise to India of "Dominion Status" in the more or less immediate future. The Statutory Commission to consider the question of responsible government for India, appointed under Sir John Simon in 1928, is expected to report in a few days. Clearly, the relations between Great Britain and what used to be called her "great dependency" are in a very fluid state; in the coming Conference rather than in methods of violence rests the best hope of moulding them nearer to the claims of justice.

**Agricultural
Unemployment.**

In the national emergency of war, party divisions were obliterated; ministers were given *carte blanche* over the national finances; "vested interests" were largely disregarded; everything was subordinated to the one great end of success. But in face of the national emergency of unemployment and the abject failure of party-efforts to deal with it, there has been no corresponding union of national forces. The Tory-Liberal Coalition failed; the all-powerful Conservative government failed, to its greater shame; the Minority Labour government has failed even more completely, though it pledged its existence on success: plainly under the present industrial system no party, however strong, can hope to solve the problem. But the industrial system cannot be radically changed except by revolution; it follows that under pain of revolution the parties must try to come together in order to set the country on its feet again. And since all the necessities of life—food, clothing, shelter, and the raw material of every industry—come from the land, it would seem that it is with the land that they should begin. If the united genius of our statesmen cannot devise some scheme for bringing idle hands and vacant lands together, to the country's immense profit, there is little hope for the nation; it will slowly but surely blunder through bankruptcy into revolution. No purely party scheme holds any promise of success, for the crisis is such that it calls for the sincere co-operation of all. Last November the Prime Minister appealed to Parliament to consider itself a National Council for the settlement of this question, of which he had so far recognized the paramount

importance that he had appointed three Ministers,—one whole time, the others, part,—to deal with it. But he did not follow up his suggestion by any formal invitation of Liberal and Tory help, with the result that the Ministry for Unemployment has been a thorough and dismal failure,—so much so that were election pledges to be considered seriously, the government would in honour be bound to resign. The figures of unemployment are rapidly approaching the two million mark; the land of the country is steadily going out of cultivation; there being a drop of 400,000 acres and a diminution of 100,000 workers during the last few years. Yet Germany has 20 per cent of her population on the land, France 22 per cent, Denmark 31 per cent, whereas here there are only 3.8 per cent. We are importing £300,000,000 worth of products which could be grown on our own soil; in fact, Lord Bledisloe has declared that, climate and all, England could be made to support almost the whole of its swarming population. There are 50 million acres of arable land available, only 9½ millions of which are in use; in 1924, there were 11 millions. Mr. MacDonald's plea for united effort was repeated with greater earnestness by Mr. Lloyd George in a recent debate on the agricultural question:

Is it really impossible for this great Parliament for once to cease taunting each other and to come together as they had done once, at any rate, to save the nation from a great peril? Here is another, in my judgment. I consider it a real peril to this country that we have got only 3 per cent of the population engaged in the most important and healthy industry. I appeal to the Government to take the initiative, to Conservative members, who in the main represent agricultural industries, and to Liberal members, who will be quite willing to come into a general consultation. Let us put our best minds in and put partisanship outside. Let us come in, each with our own proposals, ruling nothing out. The nation has demonstrated more than once that it was quite equal to an emergency, however great, and I appeal to it on this occasion to save agriculture and the countryside from ruin.

The Government seem to have responded in some fashion to this appeal (*Times*, May 22nd), and we may hope for some definite result: if not, the country will again have been sacrificed to party.

**Back
to the Land.**

Even though the Labour Party are mostly town-dwellers with little practical acquaintance with the needs of agriculture, they should have sense enough to know that the remedy for excessive industrialism lies precisely here—in retracing, as far as possible, the evil courses into which uncontrolled Capitalism has led the country. Leo XIII. would have told them to multiply small owner-

ships—the policy of the Distributist League, and of course the direct contrary to Socialist theory, which is the abolition of ownership altogether. Common sense could have shown them that men will work best and most willingly for their own immediate interest—a psychological fact which has inspired such movements as the “National Homocroft Association,” the fourth annual meeting of which was held in London the other day and of which the object is, as detailed in our pages for July 1927, to produce food for personal use,—“Sustenance not Sales”—and the “Scottish Catholic Land Association,” a body that aims at resettling families on the land so that they may live really human lives. A wise government would foster and extend such movements by every means in its power; would try to initiate them if they did not exist; but we doubt if Mr. Thomas and his satellites have even heard of them.

Economics.

With the political aspects of Mr. Snowden's second Budget we have no concern, but, as economists, we are deeply interested. The direct taxation per head in this country just before the war would, if evenly distributed, have come to £4 6s. 5d.; in 1926—27 it represented £18 12s. 6d., yet out of a total electorate of 28½ millions only 2½ have taxable incomes! “No taxation without representation” was the principle which, in the course of history, brought the predatory tendencies of government under some sort of control, but the control itself has now passed into the hands of those who are not directly taxed and who are, therefore, not disposed to exercise it in favour of the better-off. It would seem that a correlative principle should be invoked to correct the balance—“No representation without taxation”—and in fact, a *Times* correspondent lately made the suggestion that a nominal levy of say, 10s. a year should be paid voluntarily by all electors not otherwise directly taxed, so that they should *feel* that they were helping their country and not merely receiving unearned benefits. As it is, although of course they pay indirect taxes in the shape of enhanced prices due to customs and excise, and may be said, because of their numbers, to contribute the bulk of this amount, they cannot realize in the same way the cost of government, and act and vote as if the public purse were inexhaustible. According to Socialist theory, heavy taxation of the well-to-do is one ready means of counteracting the onesided distribution of wealth due to unrestricted Capitalism, but the instrument is a clumsy one and liable to abuse. There must come a time when the goose ceases to be productive and there is nothing to replace her. It would be better far to postpone for some years any increase in the vast expenditure for social services than to prevent a return to prosperity by pursuing ideals, however praiseworthy in themselves.

Dissenters and Educational Tests.

Even the most doctrinaire of Dissenters must hold that the moral and religious instruction of children is the most important part of education; that teachers should be competent to teach whatever subject they are put to teach, and that, finally, competence can be ascertained only by some sort of examination or test. Consequently the Nonconformist slogan—"no religious tests for teachers"—is easily the most imbecile that ever bigotry begot, for it implies that the very foundation of all real training may be intrusted to the incompetent. It is urged in defence that no position in the teaching profession should be closed to any teacher, solely because of his or her religious beliefs. But the fact is that no position is so closed except on grounds of incompetence. Classical positions are similarly closed to those whose sole subject is mathematics. Competence to give religious instruction to Catholic children involves both knowledge of, and practical belief in, the Catholic faith. Teachers have only to qualify in that way in order to have ready admittance, other things being equal, to Catholic staffs. Moreover, the idea underlying the complaint is that children exist for the benefit of the teachers, whereas the primary function of the latter is to represent the parents in the fulfilment of an essential part of parental duty. Therefore it is that Catholic authorities can never agree to any system which does not recognize parental rights. The State, in supplementing, or supplying for, the educational functions of the parent, in the general interest, must take into account his conscientious convictions. It is strange that the Labour Party which is supposed to have the interests of the working-class especially at heart, is not more alive to the unfair discrimination to which the poor parent is liable in having his rights over-ridden in this matter by the civil authority. The present Minister of Education has apparently inherited the old "liberal" or secularist tradition, for he shows little sense of the essential injustice of his proposed solution of the question. Unhappily, the average working-class parent is only too glad to yield to the State his whole responsibility; even amongst Anglicans there is no protest in vindication of the religious rights of parent and child; their leaders for the most part are preparing to abandon the fight, and it is left to Catholics alone to make a stand against the continued violation by the State of the rights of conscience. They, in fact, are the only real Nonconformists left.

The Note of Holiness.

Certain Anglicans have, naturally enough, taken amiss the statement made by Miss Kaye Smith in the December *Dublin* that the Note of Holiness, properly understood, is not to be found in the Anglican Church. The matter is settled for Catholics, as it were *a priori*, for the Notes of the true Church mark her off from all

others and therefore cannot be reproduced, as Notes, elsewhere. But the question is also provable by observation. The possession of the Note of Holiness means that a noticeable proportion of Catholics, through the practice of the Catholic religion, attain heroic sanctity, which is divinely attested through miracles, wrought either by them or through their intercession. How manifest that Note has always been, and how especially conspicuous it is to-day in the Catholic Church, Père Plus's recent volume (noticed in our last issue) on the subject has shown. For Anglicanism such a claim can in no way be substantiated, as Newman's brother-in-law, the Rev. T. Mozley, frankly confessed. "The Church of England [he wrote] has swept out of all recollection of fifteen centuries of great, good and holy men, with all their works, whatever they were. What does it show instead? In its own lines it can show some learned and exemplary divines, one or two Christian poets and a few ladies of rank and piety." And he goes on to give what he considers one reason for this—"When the Church of England had done its best to destroy the traces and the very memory of thousands of saints, by a singular retribution it became barren. The very idea of the man or woman favoured with extraordinary grace and living a divine life, is extinct."¹ Writers in the *Church Times* (January 31st; May 9th) deny this vehemently. The Anglican Church, they say, has crowds of saints; only it has not cared to call attention to them! One polemist enumerates six since the Reformation, including, with some lack of humour, Blessed Thomas More in his list. But it is not the Church that calls attention to God's saints; it is God Himself who witnesses to their exceptional holiness by the favours He showers upon them, in life and after death. And when a *cultus* has sprung up because of the closeness of their union with God, then the Church examines the genuineness of those evidences and, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, either rejects or confirms that *cultus*. Without such official guarantee, there could be no certainty that such *cultus* was wisely bestowed. We may freely grant that many lead holy lives outside the visible fold of the Church; that none of them attain heroic sanctity may be due to the fact that those called to such perfection are given, amongst extraordinary gifts, the more common gift of faith.

**The
Priesthood for
Women.**

In these days when so much unfair legal discrimination against women has been swept away and when, on the other hand, extreme feminists are pressing for absolute equality with men in the ecclesiastical as well as in the civil order, we Catholics must congratulate ourselves that we belong to a Church ruled by definite and changeless traditions in this matter, one which confines the

¹ "Reminiscences of the Oxford Movement," ii. 371.

service of the Sanctuary to the male sex. No agitation can arise amongst Catholic women, on the grounds that they are debarred from functions which they could exercise as well as, or even better than, men, for the matter is settled, not by natural aptitudes, but mainly by divine ordinance. The Church has always interpreted Our Lord's action in passing over His all-perfect Mother and the other saintly women who so faithfully ministered to Him, and appointing only men to the sacred ministry, as a rule for her own practice. Were this *de facto* not God's will, she would have gone astray in a matter of primary importance and inflicted cruel injustice on countless generations of women. Outside the Church, it is not so easy to justify the exclusion of women from these high privileges. As long ago as 1919, a Committee appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury to investigate the subject, reported rightly enough, that there is no historical warrant for the admission of women to the priesthood. "The restriction of the ministry of the priesthood to men originated in a generation which was guided by the special gifts of the Holy Spirit. The evidence of the New Testament is the evidence of that generation." This report has not prevented the agitation being still carried on amongst non-Catholics and, as far as preaching is concerned, the battle in principle has been won. But the Church has always distinguished between the prophet and the priest; in religious communities of women, religious discourses are normally delivered by the superior, women are amongst the best speakers in the C.E.G., and the practice might conceivably be extended, for instance, in the foreign missions, without infringing on the Church's invariable rule of confining the priesthood to men.

**Wet,
Dry, and Damp
in U.S.A.**

The experimental poll engineered by *The Literary Digest* on the prohibition issue in America has somewhat comforted those who believe in the essential sanity of the human race. For out of 4½ million votes hitherto recorded, more than three million are against that unjust enactment, those for total repeal numbering 1,836,104, and those for modification 1,340,441. The final record—the poll closes as we write—cannot substantially upset this verdict which vindicates a large majority of the voters from sympathy with a disastrous puritan experiment, one which has grievously injured America's reputation in the eyes of the world, as well as wrought untold moral harm to the country itself. Of course, it is open to anyone to argue that the majority of the unpollled millions favour prohibition; even were that so, the Amendment would not be justified. Liberty cannot rightly be abolished for an entire community unless it has been universally abused and there is no other less drastic remedy, or unless the whole community freely consents to the deprivation. The last figures show 70 % against prohibition.

The
Irish Censorship.

But what is censorship of literature but the taking away of liberty? Because A takes harm from bad books, why should B be deprived of the use of them? Because a bad book is not to be compared to good liquor which can be rightly used, but to a noxious drug which is always harmful. No one objects to the public being forbidden free access to cocaine or opium; such things are properly "prohibited." Hence nothing but praise can be given to the Irish Free State authorities for banning, in what we hope is only a preliminary list, certain obnoxious books which have done grievous harm here and in America. Their action is based on the inspiration of the movement against commercialized vice everywhere. Law has succeeded in suppressing a great deal of traffic in evil, whether it be by its fight against the White Slave trade, or against abuse of the mails, or against indecent plays and films. Against bad books the struggle is harder, for they often sail under the colours of Science or Art, but, given a sound Catholic public opinion, it should achieve its aim.

THE EDITOR.

III. NOTES ON THE PRESS

[A summary survey of current periodicals with a view to recording useful articles which 1) expound Catholic doctrine and practice, 2) expose heresy and bigotry, and 3) are of general Catholic interest.]

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE.

Mediation of Our Lady in early Christian writings [J. Lebon in *Recherches de Théologie*, April 1930, p. 129].

Petrine Promise: Why omitted by Mark and Luke [V. McNabb, O.P., in *Blackfriars*, May 1930, p. 274].

CATHOLIC DEFENCE.

Anglican "Comprehensiveness," II. [J. Keating, S.J., in *Month*, June 1930, p. 522].

Anti-Clerical Catholic Laymen [J. D. Hannan in *America*, April 12, 1930, p. 8].

Atheist Non-Sense [W. J. Blyton on C. E. M. Joad in *Catholic Gazette*, May, 1930, p. 143].

Birth Prevention. The Campaign against [*National Life*, April, 1930].

Cinema, Perils of the, recognized by secular authorities [T. W. C. Curd in *Catholic Times*, May 16, 1930, p. 11].

Douglas, James: his ignorance of the Faith [H. G. Hughes in *Catholic Times*, April 25, 1930, p. 11].

Education? Does the State provide genuine [Fr. McNabb, O.P., in *Catholic Times*, May 16, 1930, p. 11].

Faith, Loss of, due primarily to personal causes [*Southwark Record*, April-May, 1930; *Catholic Times*, May 2, 1930, p. 9].

Humanists at Variance [F. Talbot, S.J., in *America*, April 19, 1930, p. 44].

Indecent Publications. Campaign in France against Sale of [L'Abbé Bethleem in *Federation Nationale Catholique*, April 1930, p. 19].

"Leakage," A Cure for the [J. Leycester King, S.J., in *Month*, June 1930, p. 510].

Luther's Translation of Bible based on Catholic versions [*Fortnightly Review* (St. Louis), May 1930, p. 103].

"Morning Post" on Catholic "Divorces," Exposure of the [*Catholic Gazette*, May 1930, p. 152].

Protestant Vagaries [G. K. Chesterton in *Universe*, May 23, 1930, p. 7].

Relics, Authentic and Spurious, II. [H. Thurston, S.J., in *Month*, June, 1930, p. 536].

Russian Persecution of Faith and Morals [H. Somerville in *Christian Democrat*, April 1930, p. 51].

Tolerance in Maryland [*Commonweal*, April 23, 1930, p. 699].

Turmel, L'Abbé, as Modernist: exposure and suspension of [E. Dumoutet in *Revue Apologetique*, May 1930, p. 578].

POINTS OF CATHOLIC INTEREST.

Catholic Art [E. Lester, S.J., in *Tablet*, May 17, 1930, p. 659].

Catholics at non-Catholic Universities [Rev. T. Fish in *Blackfriars*, May 1930, p. 263].

Economic Unrest, Dangers of [M. Williams in *Commonweal*, April 9, 1930, p. 645].

Education; Pope on limits of Catholic concession [*Catholic Gazette*, May 1930, p. 155].

Marriage-rate in Ireland, Lowness of [J. J. Walsh in *America*, March 29, 1930, p. 592].

Papacy, The, as a Moral Force [H. Somerville in *Christian Democrat*, May 1930, p. 71].

Paraguay Jesuit "Reductions" [R. Fulop Miller in *Commonweal*, April 9, 16, 23, 1930].

Prohibition: how it was "put over" in U.S.A. [E. S. Bates in *Commonweal*, April 16, 1930, p. 630].

Savonarola, In Defence of [S. M. Hogan, O.P., in *Blackfriars*, March, April, May, 1930].

Upholland Seminary. Ceremonies at re-opening of New Chapel [*Tablet*, May 17, 1930, p. 646].

Women's Dress: Papal Ban on Immodesty [Text in *Catholic Gazette*, May 1930, p. 147].

Workers, The, and the Church [A. de Solages, S.J., in *Revue Apologetique*, May 1930, p. 586].

REVIEWS

I—A HISTORY OF SCIENCE¹

THE author of this work has already written copiously on similar subjects, and on more than one branch of physical science he speaks with expert authority. He has the enthusiasm of his subject, combined with an easy, narrative style, and a gift of simple exposition which makes scientific problems and theories intelligible even to the least mathematically or mechanically-minded of readers. The compass of the work is enormous, ranging as it does from the first dawn of Science (in the sense accepted by the author) in Greece of the sixth century B.C., down to the latest developments of modern physical theories. As might have been expected, not all of this vast history has been mastered with the same degree of comprehension: nor are the proportions of the work, regarded as a world-history of the human mind in one department of its activity, always beyond criticism. The author is an Englishman, and the standpoint of the work as regards the modern period, is somewhat Anglocentric. Huxley and Darwin, and of contemporary writers, Whitehead and Eddington, dominate the field of thought in Mr. Dampier-Whetham's account, in a way that would appear strange to a foreign reader. Sometimes one has the impression of just overhearing the cultured gossip of a Cambridge common-room—interesting, but perhaps a trifle too ephemeral to fill such a space in the History of Science.

On the whole, however, the non-scientific reader (whom the author no doubt has principally in view) will find both interest and profit from the portions of the work dealing with science proper. But the title of the book reminds us of two other elements of which Mr. Dampier-Whetham undertakes to treat, Philosophy and Religion. Science, Philosophy and Religion—a considerable part of the history of thought presents a kind of triangular duel between these three. Although Mr. Dampier-Whetham thinks that perhaps modern science represents the greatest triumph of the human intellect, probably the majority of his readers will be inclined to award the first place of importance to one or other of its two rivals. We find it somewhat difficult to determine the author's own position in philosophy. As regards religion, there is less difficulty. He favours an extremely vague, undogmatic type of Anglican modernism. Ritual is for him of more importance than dogma. Religion is an experience; dogma represents the always unsuccessful effort to turn that experience into a philosophy. The great majority of mankind requires dogma, but "true religion" can quite

¹ *A History of Science and its Relations with Philosophy and Religion.* By William Cecil Dampier-Whetham, M.A., F.R.S. Cambridge University Press. Pp. xxi. 514. Price, 18s. n.

well dispense with it. "True religion," in this account, is, of course, the religious emotion itself. Hence, dogma may be condoned, as a constitutional weakness of the average human intellect, but the ideally religious man will sit but lightly to it. No wonder that the author finds the nearest approach to the perfect type in contemporary Anglicanism. The author shows little or no comprehension of the Catholic standpoint in regard either to theology, philosophy or science. We regret all the more this failure of comprehension, as it is so manifestly not wilful. The author clearly desires and means to be not only absolutely fair towards all points of view, but appreciative of all. But we are all inclined at times to regard external systems as dead things; and that is how Mr. Dampier-Whetham regards the "world-view" of Catholicism. That is precisely the reason of his failure.

In conclusion, we may point out one common error which is repeated on several pages of this work. It is not one of the major misapprehensions of the Catholic standpoint, but it may serve as an example of the kind of mistake that has long been current, and has passed into a tradition lying beyond the reach of criticism. We allude to the statement that Catholic theologians in the sixteenth century were interested in geocentric astronomy *for its own sake*: that in some way the earth's central position was regarded by them as indicating the unique dignity of our globe and so preparing the mind for acceptance of the doctrine of the Incarnation. There is, so far as we are aware, hardly a particle of evidence anywhere for this view. On the contrary, the scholastic philosophers always supposed that the heavenly bodies were of a more perfect nature and a nobler composition than the earth. The sublunary sphere, in which the earth was situated, was the *unique* scene of generation and corruption and qualitative change. Nor was the immobility of the earth regarded as a perfection. The circular movements of the heavenly spheres represented a preferable condition. It is modern astronomy rather than the ancient system, that has ennobled the earth's status, by giving it a definite rank among the heavenly orbs, and a share in their movements. Mediæval theology had one objection, and one only, to urge against the Copernican doctrine—that it appeared to contradict the word of Scripture. It is on that ground alone that the condemnation of Galileo proceeds. There was no *a priori* dogmatic objection whatever to the new teaching.

2—SAVONAROLA. A NEW BIOGRAPHY¹

SOMETIMES at least it is a not wholly-frivolous interest which prompts the busy reader of a work of fiction to turn, prematurely as it might seem, to its concluding pages. On

¹ By Piero Misciatelli. English version by M. Peters-Roberts. Cambridge: Heffer. Illustrated. Pp. x. 218. Price, 10s. 6d. n.

the assumption that the book itself is not wholly frivolous, in which case it does not claim attention, the reader may reasonably wish to know whether its conclusion is indicative of a serious purpose. Somewhat similarly in the case of a biography, it is the concluding chapter, the record, not of what last happened to a man but, of what he last did, which may often give the truest key to his character. In no instance, perhaps, is it more true than in that of Savonarola, to say that his life, to be adequately understood, must be, so to say, *thought*, since it cannot be read, *backwards*. It is by his latest acts that he must be finally judged. "The figure of Fra Girolamo Savonarola," says his latest biographer, "irradiated with the halo of martyrdom, stands out on the pages of history as one of the noblest and purest assertors of his own political and religious faith" (Preface, p. v.). With this preliminary appreciation we cannot by any means wholly agree. Turning to the closing years of Savonarola's life, his letters to the European princes, calling on them to convoke a Council with a view to the deposition of the Pope, even though that Pope was so unworthy an occupant of the Apostolic See as was Alexander VI.,—these letters constituted, to say the least, an act of high treason for which the only possible excuse is that of honesty of purpose, and are a clear indication of a disordered judgment. Only less blameworthy, we hold, were his consent to the Ordeal by Fire, his continuing to preach after he had been forbidden to do so, his refusal, by anticipation, to leave Florence even at the Pope's orders, on the ground that to do so would be a sin against charity, in view of the need of his continued presence in the city which had been for so long the scene of his labours; these incidents are surely sufficient to show that, with all allowance for "good faith," his principles of action were fundamentally unsound. Moreover, to go back to an earlier period of his life, his reliance on those alleged prophetic visions which led him to invite Charles VIII. to come into Italy as its divinely appointed saviour, not without disastrous results, should be enough, we think, to justify the conclusion that he was the victim of more than one illusion. It is indeed strange, in the light of his opening words, already quoted, that Signor Misciatelli substantially agrees with us on more than one of the cases just mentioned.

Picturesque narrative, of which there is abundance in the volume before us, cannot be taken as an adequate counterpoise to a certain lack of firmness in the learned writer's judgment on what are really crucial points in Savonarola's career. Perhaps the most striking things in the book are the illustrations, taken in conjunction with the author's remarks on the great preacher's influence, largely posthumous, on the religious art of the Renaissance.

3—RELIGION AND ECONOMICS¹

IT would be worth the while of Catholic students to give more attention to the relations between religion and social conditions in post-Reformation England. The Middle Ages and the Reformation period have been fairly well covered, but there has not been much study of the later period. Caution is needed in adopting Max Weber's thesis that English Puritanism was the main influence in forming the morals of Capitalism. A more judicious estimate is given by Mr. Tawney in his "Religion and the Rise of Capitalism." Dr. W. J. Warner, judging by his diction, is an American. He makes claims, which he goes far to substantiate, for the social value of the Wesleyan movement in its early period. It was a movement of the poor, it moralized those who were grievously neglected by the more fashionable forms of Protestantism, it eschewed and even opposed radical politics, but it set such an example of human equality in its own life that it was perhaps the most powerful of the dissolvents of the oppressive stereotyping of classes in the eighteenth century. The early Methodists particularly cultivated the "economic virtues" of sobriety, frugality, honesty and industry, and they thus helped England to make the most of her opportunities in a time of trade expansion. They also enabled the Methodists to prosper in this world and raise their own social status. From a movement of the poor Methodism became the religion of a rather hard and narrow section of the middle class. Dr. Warner does not mince his words in referring to this development, but he does not describe it in detail. Most of his book deals with the Golden Age of Methodism, the lifetime of its founder. A Catholic reader is struck by the nearness of Wesley to Catholic social doctrine. His teaching about wealth was summed up in the advice, "Gain all you can, save all you can, give all you can." The first two injunctions are not literally in accord with Gospel teaching and, as might have been feared, the time came when those who followed Wesley on the two points forgot the third. But in fairness to Wesley it must be said that he put all the emphasis on the giving, and his precepts of gaining and saving had a practical justification in the prevalence of the vices of sloth and extravagance among the population to which he addressed himself.

Though this book is of real interest and value it is strangely inconclusive when judged by its title. The Industrial Revolution scarcely comes into the book, and it was only in its infancy during the period with which Dr. Warner deals. The words "liberal" and "illiberal" are used as if they were synonymous with right and wrong; the truth is that the liberalism which takes the credit

¹ *The Wesleyan Movement in the Industrial Revolution.* By W. J. Warner, Ph.D. London: Longmans. Pp. x. 299. Price, 15s. net.

for political reforms of a beneficent character must accept responsibility for social and industrial developments which everybody must deplore.

H.S.

4—NEW LIGHT ON STEPHEN GARDINER¹

PROFESSOR JANELLE of Strasbourg has done good service to students of the Tudor period of our history in editing three treatises of that outstanding personality, Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester. Two of the tracts,—the “*De Vera Obedientia*” and the “*Si sedes illa*,”—were written in 1535 to justify the rejection of the Pope’s supremacy and the assumption of *quasi*-papal powers by the English sovereign. In the former of the two, the Bishop gives a regular treatise on the royal supremacy, “cunningly written,” as Pole declared, “but full of the falsest arguments”; in the latter, a particular application of the doctrine to the case of Cardinal Fisher, but with no pretension to unity or even consistency: it seems rather a popular appeal in defence of the execution of the Cardinal in answer to the Brief of the Pope to Francis I. condemning the same. Whether or not they reflect the deeper feelings of Gardiner, both tracts, the editor points out, “were not written with the object of expressing and furthering the truth as such, but in view of a political result to be achieved and so as to take political circumstances into account. They are diplomatic documents drafted in order to strengthen Henry VIII.’s position after the breach with Rome.” The third tract, the “*Contemptum humane legis*, etc.” was written in 1541 and forms part of the controversy between Gardiner and the Strasbourg reformer, Martin Bucer. “Its strange and paradoxical title,” writes the editor, “should lead to no mistake; the question is not really whether the contempt of human law ought to be punished more severely than the transgression of the divine law, but whether the unlimited power of the king, now a Pope as well, coupled with submission and humbleness on the part of the subject, was to prevail over biblical theocracy coupled with the acknowledgment of the rights of man.” As regards Gardiner’s political thought, this tract “is strikingly akin to ‘*De Vera Obedientia*,’ with the very important difference, though, that not a word is here said of the Papacy and that the prince’s supremacy over the Church is taken for granted.” “And yet, a great change seems to have come over Gardiner between 1535 and 1541. No concession is now made to Protestant tastes or phraseology; the very texts of Scripture, which in ‘*De Vera Obedientia*,’ were put forward as a lure to the reformers, are now turned into weapons against them. The emphasis is

¹ *Obedience in Church and State*. Three Political Tracts by Stephen Gardiner: edited with Introduction, Translation, and Notes, by Pierre Janelle. Cambridge University Press. Pp. lxx. 221. Price 15s. n.

not now laid upon liberation from Rome but upon the maintenance of beliefs and practices which Protestants considered as essentially Roman."

Two of the tracts, the "*Si sedes illa*" and the "*Contemptum humane legis*," have hitherto been available to students only in manuscript. The "*De Vera Obedientia*" was published by Berthelet in London in 1535, two further editions appearing in Strasbourg and Hamburg respectively in the following year. Professor Janelle has taken the text of Berthelet, marking in footnotes the variations to be found in the two other editions. Facing the Latin text, he has printed translations. The English rendering of the "*Si sedes illa*" is from a manuscript contemporary with Gardiner's Latin original: that of the "*De Vera Obedientia*," usually but doubtfully ascribed to Bale, was printed at Rouen in 1553, a subsequent edition appearing in the same town and a third at "Rome" in the same year. Here the "Roman" text has been used. These translations, therefore, quite apart from their purely historical value, supply useful texts for the study of English. As translations, indeed, they contain many inaccuracies, which, however, are duly noted by the editor in footnotes. Professor Janelle has himself supplied the translation of the third tract. A scholarly introduction of some seventy pages explains the circumstances that gave occasion for the tracts and incidentally throws light on Gardiner's character and on the position he took up as regards the religious changes of the period. Of the "*Si sedes illa*," for instance, which in the recent biography of Gardiner by J. A. Muller is dismissed in a line or two, Professor Janelle writes: "In its moral aspect, '*Si sedes illa*' is, in parts at least, a monument of the most repulsive hypocrisy. Gardiner is here found at his lowest. He knew old Bishop Fisher for what he really was, a devoted adherent of the Roman See who considered the cardinal's hat sent him by the Pope as a supreme honour of which he was unworthy, and heroically laid down his life in the defence of papal supremacy. Now the character which Gardiner gives to his old chancellor is that of an inconsistent poltroon, who viewed death with terror and would have bought life at any price. He makes Fisher address the Pope from his grave and complain to him of his elevation to the cardinalate . . . Gardiner's bad faith here borders on the ludicrous, but it is bad faith all the same. It was, no doubt, the height of diplomatic skill . . . But the attempt is scarcely creditable to Gardiner's moral character, still less to his sense of humour." The book is certainly a notable contribution to our historical studies of the period and should be widely used. It is to be hoped that the larger work on the Bishop, promised by the editor, in which Gardiner's ideas, both political and religious, will receive full treatment, will be soon forthcoming.

L.H.

SHORT NOTICES.

BIBLICAL.

IN A Catholic Harmony of the Four Gospels (B.O. and W.: 7s. 6d.)

Dr. Barton, Professor of Holy Scripture at St. Edmund's College, adapts for English use the *Synopsis Evangelica* of Père Lagrange, O.P., under whom he himself studied at Jerusalem. Dr. Barton has added a good deal of his own by way of introduction and notes, which should add much to the usefulness of the book. While himself using the Douay Version he generously remarks that "it is some consolation to know that for reference purposes the Westminster Version is nearing completion, so far as the New Testament is concerned." His Grace the Archbishop of Liverpool, in the preface which he has contributed to the volume, also remarks upon the superior value of the Westminster Version for the study of the Synoptic Problem, "as in that work considerable care has been taken to render the same Greek word employed by different authors, by Matthew and Mark for instance, by the same English equivalent throughout the translation." It is encouraging to have such testimonies rendered to the Westminster Version, and we are confident that Mgr. Dean's edition of St. Luke's Gospel, due when Acts have been published, will show his usual care for uniformity, and thus have all that value for Synoptic studies which is anticipated. Meanwhile, an actual harmony of the Gospels in the Westminster Version is still further distant, and in any case we may safely return the compliment and prophesy for the volume before us a permanent value in the future. The work both of Père Lagrange and Dr. Barton deserves it, and the get-up of the book, always rather a problem in Gospel harmonies, leaves nothing to be desired.

CANON LAW.

After the short and practical books on the Code of Canon Law come the full-dress commentaries on the whole or parts of it. In *Normae Generales Iuris Canonici: Commentarius Libri I Codicis Iuris Canonici*, by Father Michiels, O.M.C., of the Catholic University of Lublin, published by the University, we have a notable commentary on the first 86 canons of the Code. This, together with the introductory *Praenotanda Generalia* on the meaning of *Ius*, *Ius Canonicum*, and on the genesis and arrangement of the Code, runs to two volumes of 521 and 525 pages respectively. The work closes with a full Index and a list of the commentaries on the first book of the Code which have appeared so far. A book on such a scale is not likely to be used by any but advanced students and teachers of Canon Law, but to them it will be of great value. The treatment throughout is very thorough. Father Michiels is well acquainted with the work done on the first part of the Code. He also and naturally makes great use of the replies of the Commission for the interpretation of the Code and the decisions of the Roman Congregations. These are brought in to give the best of illustration and support to his argument. On such occasions it would have been a great help if a short summary of the case dealt with had always been given. His text is also fresh and stimulating. Even when one may not agree with the view taken, one has to acknowledge that good reasons are given for the position adopted in a discussion which is always full, fair and exceptionally well informed. One may be inclined now and

again to think the author a little too prolix, but there can be no doubt that this work will do great service to those who use it and will take a high rank among the commentaries on the first book of the Code.

DEVOTIONAL.

Father Grönings, in *Leidensgeschichte unseres Herrn Jesu Christi* (History of the Passion of Our Lord Jesus Christ), edited by Baron van Acken, S.J. (Herder: 4 m.), has, in the form of considerations, brought together whatever help Catholic tradition and literature afford for a better understanding of Christ's Passion. In each new scene of the tremendous drama, he makes us acquainted with the historical background, with the legal, religious and civil elements which were connected with the tragedy. In addition, the author enlarges on its theological significance, its ascetical aspect, ending up with applications general as well as practical. Especially valuable appear the concrete descriptions of the actors. The book, by virtue of its objective character, will appeal to Religious, clerics, and layfolk alike.

It has often been said that the opening meditations of the Spiritual Exercises, the famous "principium et fundamentum," are of a difficult nature. To meet this difficulty Father Walter Sierp, S.J., has composed his *Ignatianische Wegweisung durch das Erdenleben* (The Ignatian guiding principle for our life on earth) (Herder: 5.60 m.). The work is the fruit of many years' experience in giving missions and retreats, and is offered to those who give or make retreats or want a solid knowledge of the Ignatian basis for the spiritual life. The first part of the book explains the foundation, showing how it is theocentric, how it unfolds the proper place of man in the Universe, and how it gives the practical principle for permeating "life as it is" with religion, nay, with the ideal of perfection. In the second part of the book a number of sketches and complete meditations give ample matter for deeper consideration, for sermons, conferences, etc.

Father Bede Jarrett, O.P., claims for his striking book of meditations for young men—*The Space of Life Between* (Sheed and Ward: 5s. n.)—that the need of it was stressed and the subjects of it suggested by a young man, who felt that there was little spiritual provision made for that period of adolescence called by Keats the space between boyhood and maturity. That young man applied to the right person to supply the want, for Father Jarrett knows the difficulties that beset the path of youth, and their appropriate solutions. As a result of his spiritual insight and lucidity of expression, his discussions of topics, important, troublesome, delicate, is always stimulating and helpful, always pointing to high yet not unattainable ideals. One small defect may be noticed. Speaking of "wine," Father Jarrett implies (p. 81) that entire abstinence is "abnormal," dictated by inability to control use. This would seem to insinuate that the practice of spiritual asceticism, to which all Christians are called by the fact of their profession, is itself abnormal. Total abstinence is simply one form of Christian "mortification."

HISTORICAL.

Mrs. Sophie O'Brien has published a sequel to the collected letters of her husband previously printed. The new volume, called, like the other,

Golden Memories (Gill and Son: 5s. n.), contains mainly letters of her mother and herself to Mr. O'Brien up to the eve of their wedding-day. They take one back to stirring days of Irish politics before the War, but so much has happened in between that their historic interest seems now very remote. However, together with Vol. I., they preserve the record of what seems to have been a unique and beautiful soul-union.

SOCIOLOGY.

The English Reformation is commonly said to have had its real origin in the lust and cupidity of a single man, Henry VIII. Rightly dividing the process into three stages—the severance of ecclesiastical jurisdiction under Henry, the incipient but abortive Protestantism in the reign of Edward, and finally the completely new system of doctrine and worship set up by Elizabeth,—Dr. Oscar Marti, of the Central Missouri State Teachers' College, enters, in his **The Economic Causes of the English Reformation** (Macmillan & Co.: 10s. 6d. n.), a plea of mitigation in regard to the charge of cupidity against Henry. He thinks that the wealth of the Church, a Church so closely united to Rome, was dangerous to the unity and stability of the kingdom, and this fact, therefore, necessitated the spoliation of the ecclesiastical corporations. The underlying assumption seems to be that the clergy were not full citizens, and that wealth in their hands necessarily was worse employed than it would have been in the possession of the laity—an assumption not borne out by history. Moreover, Henry did not begin to plunder the English Church until he had broken with the Holy See and all danger to the kingdom's financial position from that quarter was at an end. Although too prone to read the sixteenth century with the eyes of the twentieth, and too indiscriminate in his use of sources,—Wiclif, for instance, and Matthew of Paris are never very trustworthy—we feel that Dr. Marti has made an honest effort to reach the truth in this matter, and Catholics need not quarrel with the moral of his work, viz., that excessive wealth has often proved deeply injurious to the character and influence of Churchmen, in England and everywhere else, and that the "needs of the Papacy" was a plea sometimes used to cover unjust demands.

BIOGRAPHICAL.

The poetic genius of Father Gerard Manley Hopkins is surely if gradually coming into its own. No collection of his poems was published during his life-time, but copies passed from hand to hand like Shakespeare's "sugre'd sonnets" amongst his private friends and some found occasional harbourage in anthologies. Latterly the late Mr. Robert Bridges, who was the poet's literary legatee, paid supreme homage to his memory by issuing a critical edition of his poems, with invaluable annotations, and, we believe, he had in hand a fuller edition, with no doubt further comments, at the time of his lamented death. Now comes the first biography of Father Hopkins—**Gerard Manley Hopkins** (Oxford University Press: 7s. 6d. n.)—from the pen of a Canadian Jesuit, the Rev. G. F. Lahey, who, having made his theological studies at Heythrop, was inspired to make a study also of the gifted Oxonian, whose verse he had always admired. The result is this admirable volume, wherein the facts of the poet's inner and outer life are adequately presented, and a really penetrating analysis of his unique poetic theory and practice furnished

for lovers of poetry. This part of the book must be read with the Poems in hand and we conjecture will have to be read more than once, for they presuppose, as the author warns us, a competent knowledge of English prosody. But the final picture that emerges from the Life—and the author must be congratulated on the skill which causes it to stand out from such a mass of artistic detail—is that of a singularly beautiful character, equipped with every variety of intellectual culture, touching Art at many angles and "adorning everything he touched," but always seeing through Nature to the Immanent God with the clear vision of a St. Francis, always putting his unique talent to usance in the service of that Creator and inspiring in all his intimates the sense of something enskied and sainted. There are many aspects of this entrancing study which we should like to discuss did space permit, and some small criticism of detail, but we are anxious that our readers should know of it, and possess it; and there will always be occasions to recur to it.

Père Mortier, O.P., has written an edifying account of one of those heroines of charity who flower in such abundance on the soil of France. "Bonne Mère" was the title early acquired by this holy Religious, who did not in fact become one till she was over forty years of age. Then, halfway through her life, she joined the Third Order of St. Dominic, and thus connected the institute for fallen women, of which she was the head, with the French Dominican Fathers, lately revived by Lacordaire. "Bonne Mère" (Sands: 5s. n.) traversed an unwonted route to the dignity of Foundress and Superior General, a route carefully traced by Father Mortier, who gives, moreover, very interesting pen-portraits of the various distinguished personages she met with in the course of her long life of four-score years.

The saintly record of another French Foundress, differing in almost every point from that of "Bonne Mère," except in devotion to the will of God, is contained in *The Life of Emilie de Vialar* (Sands: 5s. n.), who originated the Congregation called "The Sisters of St. Joseph of the Apparition." Mother Chupin, "Bonne Mère," became a Foundress as it were by accident, and her Congregation did not spread beyond France. Mlle de Vialar seems to have been marked out for sanctity from youth, deliberately planned her Institute as soon as she had the wealth and independence to do so, and saw it spread over many missionary countries—Palestine, North Africa, Burma, Australia—before she died, comparatively young, in 1856. Its aim is, speaking generally, the Corporal Works of Mercy, especially education. The Cause of the Foundress has been introduced: as is so frequently the case, she was called upon to exhibit heroic patience under the ill-usage of tyrannical ecclesiastics.

FICTION.

Mr. Thornton Wilders, whose *Bridge of San Luis Rey* endeared him to many, despite the artificiality and indebtedness of much of it, has written *The Woman of Andros* (Longmans: 6s. n.), partly based on a comedy by Terence. It relates an episode in the life of an ex-courtesan who had established herself in Brynos and held a sort of "salon" in her house for the benefit of the culturable youth, so to say, of that island. The Greek atmosphere is charmingly given—physically, that is: I do not believe that even a Platonized courtesan of that place or period thought in the least like Chrysis. The last pages, however, the emotions of Glycerium, Chrysis's sister, and of little Argo, sister of Pamphilus who

loved Glycerium and was loved by Chrysis, are so true to reality that they become timeless and make the whole book worth while. Though it deals with a sad section of life, no line would repel.

The popularity of his earlier story does not diminish, as is shown by its reissue in gift-book form, both here and in America. The English illustrated edition of *The Bridge of San Luis Rey* is published by Messrs. Longmans at 7s. 6d. n., with sixteen woodcuts by Miss Claire Leighton; their technical excellence cannot be doubted, but to us they seem hardly to suit the spirit of the book.

M. Anda Cantegrive in *La Nécropole D'Or* (Editions de la Vraie France: 12.00 fr.) has written a charming story centreing about the "silver Latin" poet Ausonius, who lived during the fourth century at Bordeaux. The town, like so many others in Gaul, was thoroughly Romanized at that date, and it is possible to recapture from the writings of the poet himself, as M. Cantegrive has admirably done, much of the atmosphere, Pagan and Christian, of that flourishing centre. The author's learning is lightly worn, and he has shown how to invest an ancient scene with ever-living human emotions.

VERSE.

Regarding the sonnets which make up the bulk of Lady Wentworth's collection of poems, *Flame of Life* (John Murray), the critic, as critic, is dumb: he recognizes the work of an expert. No one who loves the sonnet can fail to see at once that these are genuine: they are not efforts or imitations or experiments: they are genuine transcripts of real moods; original as are the sonnets of Shakespeare, Milton and Wordsworth, and, in form, they belong to the school of those three poets, untouched by the wholly different order of beauty introduced by Rossetti. We may compare them to precious stones, each complete in itself, presenting in sum an endless variety of colour, but individually one colour only, clear and cold. These latter qualities are of the very essence of their perfection, and I can find no higher praise than to say that they express the deepest emotions, love, hope, sorrow, hate, despair, with that masterful restraint which is the supreme excellence of the sonnet. Lady Wentworth is at pains to show in her preface that the "verse-maker" is an interpreter of human nature: she excels in the power of "fixing" and reproducing the vision of the moment. If one prefers a greater abandonment or impulsiveness in the varied emotions of passion than appears in these gem-like poems, well and good: but to say that they lack such treatment is merely to say that the ruby does not feel to the hand as does a piece of red velvet; and there are those who prefer the ruby. Of the poems other than sonnets it is hardly fair to speak, with the memory of the sonnets fresh in one's mind. They are mainly of the nature of satiric verse, save for one small section of tuneful and glittering lyrics. The verse is pungent and homely: the lyrics beautiful of their kind; but we should prefer them separate. They do not add to the sonnets, which indeed we should prefer in a slim volume or two by themselves.

Very beautiful are the poems in honour of Our Lady, under the heading "The Beloved Woman," in Father Garesché's *The Torrent and Other Poems* (Loyola University Press: \$1.50). Beautiful, too, are many of the other pieces, both secular and devotional, especially "Communion

in the Hospital," with which this American Jesuit closes a book that will give deep pleasure and spiritual inspiration to many grateful readers.

NON-CATHOLIC.

At a time when certain continental Catholics seem to wish to limit the scope of the Spiritual Exercises to beginners, instead of recognizing them as amongst the best means of arriving at moral perfection, it is comforting to find them becoming more and more appreciated by our separated brethren. The Rev. W. H. Longridge, S.S.J.E., is well-known as the editor of an excellent translation of the Exercises and Directory, and has done much to popularize retreats in Anglican circles. He has now compiled a volume of **Retreats for Priests** (Mowbray: 10s. 6d. n.), based on the plan of the Exercises, and containing, besides the main characteristic meditations, a number of others on the Life of Our Lord, intended to create and direct zeal for priestly perfection. Though a great deal of the matter is the author's own, we have noticed little that is not in harmony with Catholic asceticism: the eschatology may be a little hazy: the Eucharistic doctrine defective; but the moral ideal set before the exercitant is thoroughly Ignatian, *i.e.*, evangelical, and the book cannot fail to do much good in its own milieu.

MINOR PUBLICATIONS.

The well-known ascetical writer Canon A. Saudreau has published several large volumes on his subject. We are not told whether a small translated pamphlet, **Perfect Self-Abnegation and Perfect Love** (B.O. and W.: 1s.), is an extract from a longer treatise of his or an independent composition. In any case, it conveys in simple direct language the familiar doctrine that we must lose our life to find it, and provides a useful summary of the means and the result.

The Jesuit Mission Press is doing good work by its helpful little pamphlets, detailing aspects of Mission Life, such as **Avelino: a Tale of the Ilocarno Country**, by T. J. Feeney, S.J. (5 c.), or guiding prayers for that intention by, for instance, the issue of **St. Francis Xavier's Novena of Grace** (10 c.).

The C.T.S. has issued a long series of new pamphlets and reprints which we can only mention. Fr. Newdigate's invaluable **Our Martyrs: a Chronological List** has been brought up to date in a third edition; **St. Wenceslas, Patron of Czechoslovakia** is a timely pamphlet by Mgr. J. Hanush; Lancashire should purchase largely the life of **Blessed John Blessington** of Burton, by Dr. Mary Cardwell; **The Catholic Needlework Guild**: its work and methods is described by the Hon. Sec., C. Faudel-Phillips; **The Popular Guide to Westminster Cathedral** should become increasingly popular so many are the additions to it; **The Enthronement of the Sacred Heart in the Home** would be still more useful if it included the formula for the consecration-service; **The Stations of the Cross**, by St. Alphonsus, and **The Contemplation of St. Augustine**, are in the smaller "devotional" format; **The Soviet Campaign against God** is the Pope's testimony to the reality and extent of the Russian Persecution.

From the Irish C.T.S. comes an account of the **General Persecutions**, by W. E. Baker, and a description of the famous **Burrishoole Abbey**, by the Rev. M. O'Donnell, C.C.; Also two devotional pamphlets devoted to the Passion called **The Footsteps of Jesus**.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Reviewed in present issue or reserved for future notice.)

- ALEXANDER OUSELEY, London.
Secret Places. By E. M. Allen.
Pp. 328. Price, 7s. 6d.
- BEAUCHESNE, Paris.
La Doctrine du Mariage selon St. Augustine. By B. A. Pereira, O.F.M. Pp. xi. 247. Price, 30.00 fr. *Verbum Salutis.* Vol. V. Edited by Paul Jouon, S.J. Pp. xxiii. 617. Price, 45.00 fr.
- BENZIGER BROS., New York.
College Days at the Manor. By M. D. TenEyck. Pp. 284. Price, \$1.25.
- BLACKWELL, Oxford.
The History of the Church of England, by the Venerable Bede. Translated by Thomas Stapleton. Pp. xx. 479.
- BURNS, OATES & WASHBOURNE, London.
A Supplement to the Catechism. By Rev. Bernard Kelly. Pp. v. 48. Price, 1s. n.
- C.T.S., London.
Several New Pamphlets and Reprints.
- CONSTABLE, London.
De Electione Gratiae, etc. By Jacob Bohme. Translated, with a biographical sketch, by John R. Earle, M.A. Pp. lxx. 327. Price, 10s. 6d. n.
- DESSAIN, Malines.
Trent Années d'Apostolat au Brésil. By Canon Maurice Gaspar. Pp. 166. Price, 20.00 fr.
- EDITIONS "LES BELLES LETTRES," Paris.
Luis de Leon. By A. Lugan. Pp. 200. Price, 15.00 fr.
- EDITIONS REIDER, Paris.
L'Ordre Benedictin. By Dom H. Leclercq. Pp. 76, with 60 illustrations. Price, 20.00 fr.
- ELKIN MATHEWS & MARROT, London.
Joyous Pilgrimage. By R. F. Foster. Pp. 254. Price, 7s. 6. n.
- GILL & SON, Dublin.
Apologetics and Christian Doctrine. Part I. By Archbishop Sheehan. New edition. Pp. viii. 197. Price, 1s. 6d. n.
- HERDER, Freiburg.
Der Geist des Ganzen. By Julius Langbehr. Illustrated. Pp. iv. 242. Price, 4.20 m. *De Gratia.* By H. Lange, S.J. Pp. xiv. 612. Price, 18.00 m. *De Revelatione Christiana.* By H. Dieckmann, S.J. Pp. xxii. 694. Price, 20.00 m.
- JESUIT MISSION PRESS, New York.
History of the Catholic Church in Jamaica. By F. X. Delany, S.J. Illustrated. Pp. xi. 292. Price, \$2.50.
- JOHN MURRAY, London.
The Flame of Life. By Lady Wentworth. Pp. xviii. 344. Price, 7s. 6d. n.
- LITURGICAL PRESS, Minnesota.
If I be Lifted Up. By Rev. P. Bussard. Pp. 27. Price, 10 c. *Several other Liturgical Pamphlets.*
- LONGMANS, London.
The Church and the Bible. By H. L. Goudge. Pp. viii. 118. Price, 2s. 6d. n. and 4s. n. *The Vatican Council.* By Dom Cuthbert Butler. 2 Vols. Pp. xix. 300: vii. 309. Price, 25s. n. *The Pathetic Fallacy.* By Llewelyn Powys. Pp. vii. 128. Price, 5s. n.
- OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS.
Gerard Manley Hopkins. By G. F. Lahey, S.J. Pp. 169. Price, 7s. 6d. n.
- PERRIN ET CIE, Paris.
Le Schisme Anglican. By Abbé G. Constant. Pp. 777. Price, 50.00 fr.
- SANDS AND CO., London.
St. Vincent de Paul. By P. Renaudin. Translated by Cecil Kerr. Illustrated. Pp. 104. Price, 2s. 6d. n. *The King's Series for Children.* By Rev. W. J. Roemers, C.S.S.R. Books 4, 5, 6. Price, 2d. each.
- SHEED AND WARD, London.
An Introduction to Philosophy. By Jacques Maritain. Translated by E. L. Watkin. Pp. 272. Price, 3s. 6d. n. *Thoughts Twice-dyed.* By Vincent McNabb, O.P. Pp. 86. Price, 2s. 6d. *The Space of Life Between.* By Fr. Bede Jarrett, O.P. Pp. 194. Price, 5s. n.

15
v.
3.
v.
3.
1.
4.

/n
J.
e,

y
4.

.
c.
1.

y
3.
e
n
o.
1.
y
1.

.
e,
é
e,

é
e,

.
il
s.
s
r.
s

y
d
s.
s
t
e,
e,
e.